

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 094

EA 023 369

AUTHOR Handler, Janet R.; Carlson, Deborah L.
TITLE Shaping Tennessee's Master Teacher Program--1983.
Part 1: Improving Teacher Quality through Incentives Project.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of the Secretary.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 267p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Ladders; Elementary Secondary Education; *Incentives; *Master Plans; News Media; Politics of Education; *Program Development; Public Relations; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

The development of Tennessee's Master Teacher Program is described in this case study, the first in a series of project reports. Data were derived from interviews, document analysis, transcriptions and analyses of meetings, informal conversations, questionnaires, and monitoring of legislative sessions and committee hearings. Following an introduction, the state's 1983 Master Teacher Plan and Career Ladder Program are described. Chapter 3 describes the inception and presentation of the plan. Chapters 4 and 5 examine early responses to the plan and public and legislative reactions after deferral. Key groups in program formation are identified in the sixth chapter, and the seventh chapter offers an analysis of news coverage that may have fostered public misconceptions. The final chapter discusses the program's status and issues at the end of 1983. Two tables are included. Appendices include: information about the Senate Joint Resolution 96 Study Committee and actions of the governor's office; an annotated resource directory; information on the Teachers' Study Council; the newspaper sample; the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984; and a list of 29 merit pay references. (LMI)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED340094

SHAPING TENNESSEE'S MASTER
TEACHER PROGRAM -- 1983

Part1: Improving Teacher Quality
Through Incentives Project

Sponsored by
The U.S. Department of Education
under a Grant from the Secretary
of Education's Discretionary Fund.
Funding Period: October, 1983
through March, 1985

Submitted by
Dr. Janet R. Handler
Dr. Deborah L. Carlson
The University of Tennessee,
Knoxville
Spring, 1984

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.L. Carlson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 023 369

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
PART I: IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY THROUGH INCENTIVES PROJECTS		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Purpose	
	B. Scope of the Study	
	C. Project Design	
	D. Implications	
	E. Report Organization	
II.	TENNESSEE'S MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM, 1983.....	8
	A. Master Teacher Program: Initial Development	
	B. The Career Ladder Program	
III.	THE ORIGINAL MASTER PLAN: INCEPTION AND PRESENTATION.....	21
	A. Inaugural Address	
	B. The Better Schools Program: Announcement Preparation	
	C. The January 28, 1983 Speech	
	D. The Governor Publicizes His Program	
IV.	THE MASTER TEACHER PROPOSAL: EARLY RESPONSES...	32
	A. The First Week: Support and Criticism	
	B. The Growing Controversy	
	C. From Proposal to Legislation	
V.	THE MASTER TEACHER PROPOSAL: ACTIONS AFTER DEFERRAL.....	45
	A. General Reactions	
	B. Controversy: The Governor and TEA	
	C. Legislative Reactions	
	D. Public Relations	
VI.	KEY GROUPS IN PROGRAM FORMATION.....	56
	A. Overview	
	B. The Select Committee on Education	
	C. The State Department of Education	
	D. Ad Hoc Interim Certification Commission	
	E. Teachers' Study Council	
	F. Tennessee Education Association	
VII.	ANALYSIS OF NEWS COVERAGE.....	82
	A. Purpose	
	B. Procedure	
	C. Analysis	

VIII. THE END OF 1983: STATUS AND ISSUES.....	96
A. Lack of Involvement	
B. TEA's Position	
C. Incentive Pay	
D. The Finance Issue	
E. Preparing for 1984	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	108
APPENDIXES.....	111
Appendix A. Senate Joint Resolution 96 Study Committee	
Appendix B. Governor's Office	
Appendix C. Annotated Resource Directory	
Appendix D. Teachers' Study Council	
Appendix E. List of Newspapers	
Appendix F. Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984	
Appendix G. Merit Pay References	

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

Tennessee has been a leader in the current trend toward state level education reform. Tennessee's Career Teacher Program is one of the earliest applications of the career ladder and incentive concept to statewide teacher evaluation ("Better Schools Program," 1983).

The project being reported in this document has been funded by a U.S. Department of Education grant under the Secretary's Discretionary Fund. One purpose of the project is to conduct a case study of Tennessee's Career Ladder Program. Emphasis is being placed on the Career Teacher component of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, referred to prior to passage as the Master Teacher Program. Key issues and responses to these issues during the planning and early implementation phases are being identified. A set of general recommendations will be proposed to assist states or localities anticipating or engaged in comparable merit pay or career ladder programs.

Another purpose of the grant is to provide technical assistance to the decision makers who will develop and implement the Career Teacher Program. A

portion of the grant is allocated for use by the State Department of Education to obtain consultative and research help needed for completion of its mission. Documentation of the information and assistance needs for this undertaking will be one objective of the case study. Such documentation will help decision makers in other settings to develop their own career ladder programs.

Specific objectives of the project, leading to a set of recommendations based on the Tennessee experience include:

1. Determine the processes used to establish policies and practices for the Career Teacher Program
2. Identify key problems and issues arising in relation to the program
3. Analyze the strategies used to deal with problems or issues affecting the Career Teacher program.
4. Examine the early phases of program implementation in relation to intents
5. Determine the kinds of research and assistance used by state decision makers involved with the program
6. Respond through a direct technical assistance component to selected information needs at the state level

Scope of the Study

The funding period for this project extends from October, 1983 through March, 1985. In October, 1983, the ongoing activities in the state focused on final

preparation and legislative passage of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984. The initial phase of implementation is now under way with the first group of teacher applicants for the career ladder to be chosen during the 1984-1985 school year.

Due to the timing of the funding period, events and issues prior to late Fall, 1983 have been reconstructed and analyzed from interviews, reports, minutes, media accounts, and available documents. Since that time, these data sources have been supplemented by attendance at key meetings, monitoring of legislative sessions, and other activities. Beginning in the Fall of 1984 the Career Ladder Program will be implemented in the school systems. The complexities of state level planning make it unclear at this time how far advanced the implementation process will be when this grant terminates in 1985.

Project Design

Analysis of Tennessee's Career Teacher Program is being conducted as a dynamic case study. Case studies are valuable because they help others learn from the experiences of particular groups or individuals. The case study has both an awareness role, bringing new developments to the attention of interested parties and an important instructive role, pointing out strong

points worth emulating and pitfalls to avoid. The study design permits responsive coverage of emerging events to keep up with changes occurring during development of the Tennessee program. Specific questions have been generated to gather information from key individuals representing groups involved or affected by the Career Ladder Program.

The study is being conducted in three phases:

1. the developmental period from inception of the basic framework for the program to the proposal of the Comprehensive Educational Reform Act at the close of 1983.
2. the period covering passage of the bill during a Special Legislative Session and leading up to the start of implementation in the Fall of 1984.
3. the initial phase of implementation beginning in Fall, 1984 and extending through the end of the grant period (March, 1985).

The research is being conducted by Dr. Janet R. Handler and Dr. Deborah L. Carlson of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. A three member Management Team provides regular feedback about the project. The team members are Dr. Alanson Van Fleet, University of Tennessee, Dr. George Malo, State Department of Education; and Dr. John Folger, Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies. A liaison function with the legislature and other groups in Nashville is fulfilled by Dr. Karen Weeks, Vanderbilt University. The

project's administrative assistant, Vivian Ross, is based at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Data collection and analysis have been both formal and informal . The background for this first of three reports was compiled from interviews, content analyses of pertinent documents, transcription and analysis of meetings, informal conversations with individuals, various groups' responses to questionnaires, and monitoring of legislative sessions and committee hearings. Representatives of numerous groups were interviewed, including persons at: the State Department of Education, the Interim Commission, Governor Alexander's office, The Tennessee Education Association, The Teachers' Study Council, and The Tennessee School Boards Association. The appendix included with this report provides examples of the types of documents analyzed as part of the research process. It also provides an overview of each key group associated with the program, a list of reports and other resources available from or written about that group's role, and selected examples of materials pertinent to the Tennessee Career Teacher Program.

The findings of this study, and information about the ongoing research, are being disseminated by means of published reports, journal articles, speeches at professional meetings and conferences, items in news,

media, and televised interviews. Information sharing opportunities will be particularly important during the latter part of the project, as additional reports and materials are available for distribution.

Implications

There are several important implications of this project for the improvement of teacher compensation and evaluation programs in Tennessee and elsewhere. The case study will lead to a set of recommendations based upon the events and issues in Tennessee. These recommendations will address factors that appear to have contributed to success and factors which acted as obstacles. The study will shed light on the issues which became controversial and the steps which were taken to deal with such concerns. Taken collectively, the recommendations presented will reflect a model of state level implementation of a career ladder (master teacher) program.

The guidelines generated will aid in decision making in Tennessee as the program is refined in the coming years. This program will for some time be flexible enough to benefit from information about more productive strategies.

The study will also be of immediate value to decision makers in other states currently considering

or implementing similar programs. While their specific structures and political influences may vary, the generic issues and concerns will be of common interest. Contacts are being established in a number of key states to facilitate a type of mutual support process through the exchange of ideas and developments.

It is expected, too, that this project will reveal numerous important avenues for further investigation. This particular educational reform is both broad in scope and high in interest nationwide. A case study of this type is an appropriate mechanism for identifying specific areas that warrant additional study.

Report Organization

This document is the first of three interim reports to be developed for the project. It will be followed by documents covering the legislative passage and early implementation phases of the Career Teacher Program. A final report will present concluding recommendations for developing and instituting a model career teacher program.

As a preliminary document, this publication is intended for limited distribution. An executive summary will be available for wider dissemination.

CHAPTER II

TENNESSEE'S MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM, 1983

Master Teacher Program: Initial Development

Tennessee Governor Lamar Alexander outlined his Master Teacher Proposal, one segment of the Better Schools Program, in his State of Education Address on January 28, 1983 ("Better Schools Program," 1983).

The governor's original proposal underwent several modifications in 1983. The program was developed into a legislative proposal submitted in March, 1983. It became known during the session as the "Compromise Bill" (Select Committee on Education, March 17, 1983). The final version of the bill drafted in 1983 was for presentation to the 1984 legislative session. This bill was titled the Comprehensive Education Reform act of 1984 (Select Committee on Education, December 1983).

This chapter outlines the major points of the Master Teacher Program. It summarizes the changes that transformed the plan from its original form to one that was drafted in December, 1983.

Although the emphasis of this report is the Master Teacher Program, it is important to note that a parallel program for principals has been developing at the same time. Procedures for developing the Master

Administrator Program have been similar to those of the Master Teacher Program. Criteria for evaluation have been established as well as application procedures for entry and upward mobility in terms of receiving incentive benefits. Although the programs differ and the nature of an administrator's position assumes different responsibilities than that of a teacher, the process for establishing the evaluation standards for identification of Master Administrators has been operating through a similar organizational structure.

Governor Alexander presented his program as an incentive pay system designed to attract young, outstanding people into the teaching profession and to reward teachers for excellence in teaching. He believed the program would elevate Tennessee educators to be among the best and the best paid public school teachers in the country. The first version of Alexander's plan stipulated that all teachers would be encouraged to join the system, but those already holding certificates and currently teaching would have a choice. All new teachers would be required to enter the program.

The proposed Master Teacher Program included four career stages, each one offering the teacher a five-year certificate. These career stages: Apprentice, Professional, Senior, and Master allow for upward

mobility each five years or an opportunity to renew the five-year certificate and remain at the same career level. The exception to this rule is that an Apprentice Teacher must successfully advance to the Professional level in five years or seek a new career. The State Board of Education would be responsible for licensing individuals at one of the four career stages in the program. Criteria for issuing certificates would change from the current system of paper credentials (e.g. courses taken, in-service credit, degrees held) to a system based on demonstration of successful professional performance. Individual licensure recommendations would be made by three Regional Commissions, each representing a "grand division" of the state. Each Commission would consist of a five-person Executive Board and all Master Teachers in that region. Although the State Certification Commission would make final decisions regarding certification, its recommendations would be based on the advice given by the Regional Commissions.

In the new program, a beginning teacher would enter at the Apprentice Level where he/she would remain for a minimum of three years. At this time, based on a satisfactory evaluation, the Apprentice Teacher could apply for the Professional Level. A Professional

Teacher would remain at this level for a minimum of three years and then would be eligible to advance to the status of Senior Teacher.

The Senior Teacher would be required to work an 11 month contract and assume additional responsibilities during the one month of extended employment. Of the 26,000 teachers eligible to apply for Senior status, the state would pay 100% of the extra cost for about 11,500 of these eligible teachers. Senior Teachers would be given a 30% pay increase by the state.

A teacher would be eligible for Master Teacher status upon satisfactory completion of a minimum of five years as a Senior Teacher. The Master Teacher would be required to work a 12 month contract and his/her pay would be increased by 60%. The state would pay 100% of the extra cost for approximately 4,650 Master Teachers which is 10% of all the state's teachers and one-fourth of all teachers with 11 or more years of experience.

The evaluation procedure would involve a team of Master Teachers (from outside the teacher's district) conducting classroom observations and assessments; a review of supervisors' evaluations; examination of pupil performance; a review of in-service and other professional activities; and where appropriate, a test

of knowledge of the subject being taught. Certificates would be issued upon proof of successful professional performance. The new certification system would rely heavily on professional peer evaluation. To facilitate the beginning of the Master Teacher program, a 15-member Interim Commission would be appointed by the governor to make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding evaluation of Master Teacher candidates. When the first 15 Master Teachers had been licensed in each of the state's three "grand divisions," a permanent Teacher Certification Commission would assume responsibility for the evaluation of candidates to follow.

In March of 1983, a group of six legislators revamped the governor's original proposal. Although Alexander said he did not agree with all the changes made, he stated that the major objective of finding a way to develop a workable incentive pay system remained.

In the original version, teachers would have to wait eight or more years to receive an incentive pay supplement. Under this system, approximately 35% of the state's teachers would be eligible to receive incentive pay. This quota was changed in the March version of this bill referred to above so that every teacher,

excluding the Apprentice level, would be eligible for the \$1,000 supplement. Additionally, 87% of all teachers joining the program with three or more years of experience would be eligible for special higher pay from the state. Restrictions of the quotas for those receiving state pay would be changed under the March Compromise Bill to include a 15 % cap on state-paid Master Teachers and 25% on Senior Teachers. This would increase the percentage of teachers who could receive one of the two higher supplements to 40%.

The supplement formula was also changed in the revised version of the bill, allowing Senior and Master Teachers to have an option concerning how many months they would choose to work each year. The Senior Teacher could choose a 10 or 11-month contract and the Master Teacher a 10, 11, or 12-month contract. Beginning in the 1984-85 school year, teachers would be eligible for salary supplements based on successful completion of standards for certification. A professional teacher on a 10-month contract would receive \$1,000 in addition to the base pay and any other compensation to which he/she may be entitled. Certified Senior Teachers would receive \$2,000 for a 10-month contract and \$4,000 for an 11-month contract. Certified Master Teachers would be paid \$3,000 for a 10-month contract, \$5,000 for an

11-month contract and \$7,000 for a 12-month contract. These salary supplements would be paid directly by the State Department of Education to the local education agency.

The Compromise Bill stipulated that Master Teachers could not be required to be out of the classroom to assist in the evaluation process more than 10 days out of the school year and Senior Teachers could not be out more than five days.

Evaluation of teachers for the Master Teacher Program would involve five steps: (1) a pre-evaluation interview with an evaluation team to determine performance goals based on specific subjects to be taught; (2) multiple observations of the teacher's classroom performance by the evaluation team; (3) a written evaluation covering criteria established for teaching performance and content covered; (4) a post evaluation interview in which evaluation results are discussed and an improvement plan established, if needed; and (5) an opportunity for the teacher to respond in writing to the written evaluation with the response to be attached to the written formal evaluation.

The evaluative information to be considered by the Regional and State Commissions in issuing certificates

would include observation and assessment by a team of master teachers, supervisors and/or principals outside the applicant's school system; evaluations by supervisors and principals directly in authority over teachers; a personal interview; pupil performance; review of in-service and other professional accomplishments; and proficiency tests of the teacher's knowledge.

Each of the three Regional Commissions representing the divisions of Tennessee (East, Middle, West) would under the compromise plan consist of nine persons: (1) four Master Teachers within the division; (2) two Master Principals; (3) one Master Supervisor; (4) one member from higher education in the teacher education department; and (5) one lay person. The Regional Commissions would review applications of all teachers, principals and supervisors for certification; assign evaluation teams to make recommendations to the Regional Commission and; make recommendations to the State Certification Commission for certification of Professional and Senior Teachers, Provisional and Senior Principals, and Provisional and Senior Supervisors. Members of these Commissions would serve without pay but be reimbursed for expenses while on duty.

If a teacher were dissatisfied with the decision of the Regional or State Certification Commission regarding the total evaluation process, he/she could submit a written appeal to the State Board of Education within 10 days of receipt of the decision. If the person were still dissatisfied with the State Board of Education's decision, he/she would be entitled to a judicial review as provided for in Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 4-5-322.

The grievance procedure was expanded under the compromise bill to include a more thorough review process. During the course of an appeals process, the State Certification Commission would have the authority to extend a teacher's certificate for an additional year. Further, if any teacher was dissatisfied for any reason with the Master Teacher Program, he/she could now opt to return to the old system under a provision called the "toe-in-the-water" amendment.

The last set of major changes in this new piece of legislation would reduce the proposed 21-member State Master Teacher Certification Commission to 13 members and create an 18-member Interim Commission. The Interim Commission would recommend to the State Board of Education the initial group of Master Teachers, Principals, and Supervisors.

Governor Alexander's Master Teacher Bill did not pass the Legislature in 1983. By a Joint Resolution of the Legislature however, a committee of seven Senators and seven Representatives (Select Committee on Education) was appointed in April, 1984 to study the proposed bill. They were to recommend a comprehensive reform bill for the following year's legislative session. On November 23, 1984, the Select Committee on Education voted to recommend their version of the bill to the full General Assembly. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to outlining the major provisions of this draft of the Master Teacher Program. (Comprehensive Education Reform Act, 1984).

The Career Ladder Program

The Master Teacher Program would, according to the Select Committee on Education's proposal, be referred to as the Career Ladder Program and would involve four steps: Apprentice, Professional, Senior, and Distinguished Senior. Pay incentives would remain the same. However, quotas and the state cap on dollars would be removed. Limitation of certification at any step on the career ladder would be based on high program standards, not arbitrary percentages.

The beginning teacher would serve a one-year probationary period. Entry to this position would require a passing score on a State Teacher Examination, and this position would be nonrenewable. Satisfactory completion of this period would entitle the teacher to apply for the Apprentice Level. The Apprentice certificate would be valid for three years and also could be nonrenewable. Upon successful completion of three years as an Apprentice and a passing score on a basic professional skills test, the teacher would be eligible to apply for Professional status. This certificate would be good for five years. Completion of five years of successful teaching on the Professional level and completion of two upper level academic courses would entitle the teacher to apply for Senior status. The Senior Teacher would have to teach five years at this level, complete two upper level academic courses and successfully carry out his/her assigned responsibilities to be eligible to apply for Distinguished Senior status. A Distinguished Senior Teacher could be certified for five years, have to complete two upper level academic courses and agree to fulfill a number of responsibilities in addition to teaching.

Currently employed teachers could apply to enter the Career Ladder at the appropriate level corresponding to their years of experience in teaching. Current teachers employed for the specified number of years and holding certificates could enter the ladder as follows: three years--Apprentice teacher; eight years-- Senior Teacher; 12 years--Distinguished Senior Teacher.

Options for teachers currently teaching would include: (1) Applying to enter the Career Ladder and successfully completing requirements. These individuals would be entitled to an across-the-board pay raise and an incentive pay raise; (2) Staying in the present system. These persons would still receive an across-the-board pay raise; (3) Applying to enter program, but failing to meet requirements. These teachers could keep their current certificates and remain in the old program and; (4) Applying for new program and trying it out, but opting to return to old system.

The Interim commission would be responsible for developing the criteria and instruments for evaluation of teachers. This task would be completed and the results shared with teachers across the state prior to the Legislature convening in January, 1984. The

evaluation procedure under the Career Ladder Program would remain the same as in the previous bill, with one added stipulation. The teacher would have the right to disqualify one evaluation team member prior to evaluation. The appeals process would remain the same.

The State Certification Commission would be responsible for certification of all educators. This Commission would be composed of 13 members: 10 educators, including the Commissioner of Education, and three lay people, one from each regional division of the state. This Commission would appoint three Regional Commissions and work closely with them in receiving and acting upon local recertification recommendations.

The governor's original Master Teacher Plan, and the intervening versions of the legislation would each contribute to the final form in which the bill was submitted for legislative action in 1984. The thrust of the new legislation would differ from the original proposal. The objectives of the new legislation would be to direct the program toward the attainment of high standards for the state's teachers and to commit more time and effort for staff improvement.

CHAPTER III

THE ORIGINAL MASTER TEACHER PLAN: INCEPTION AND PRESENTATION

The issues which later emerged as significant can be identified in the handling of the Master Teacher Program even from its earliest days.

Chapter III of this study document examines the inception of the master teacher concept as a viable program for Tennessee. It also focuses on the ways in which this program was presented to the legislature, the public, and the education community.

Inaugural Address

On January 15, 1983, Governor Lamar Alexander delivered his Inaugural Address, marking the start of his second term. Although he did not give details about the education reform program to be proposed, he included in his speech several recurring themes and "hints" to set the stage for that event.

He predicted that the state would before long see "more professional and better paid teachers at every level", and tied the need for a more professional teaching career to Tennessee's urgent need for new jobs and higher income levels for its citizens (Alexander,

1983). Other prerequisites for the economic progress cited by the governor included emphasis on basic skills, development of computer skills, and the acquisition of new job skills by youngsters and adults. Plans to provide those skills were later revealed when the ten-point Better Schools Program was announced ("Better Schools Program," 1983).

In his Inaugural Address and in other speeches, Governor Alexander focused on a message that was recurrent in reports published by the National Commission on Excellence, the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, and other influential groups who urged educational reforms. The return to a view from earlier years that education was the key to a sound economy, better jobs for all, and superiority over our international competitors had strong public appeal in 1983. Alexander hoped to tap this renewed belief in the value of education to put Tennessee in the forefront of a developing nationwide trend. If school reform was to be the "answer," then it appeared clear that improvement in the teaching force would become a key element of the proposed solution.

The Better Schools Program : Announcement Preparation

Details of the governor's plan were revealed in his second annual speech to the Tennessee Press Association, held on Friday, January 28, 1983 in Nashville. The speech was covered live by eleven television stations and via delayed broadcast by four stations.

In a press conference the day before (January 27, 1983), Alexander eluded to the program to be unveiled, but did not give reporters specific details. The Memphis Commercial Appeal (January 28, 1983), reported what many of the program's elements were, and noted "for more than a year (Alexander) has pushed the concept of rewarding good teachers and making 'teaching a more professional career'". However, the governor insisted at the Thursday press conference (January 27, 1983) that his plan was not merit pay, a concept he described as often a code word for diverting funds from across-the-board pay increases or for assigning teacher raises based on student test scores.

Governor Alexander declared on Wednesday, January 26, 1983 that he would not seek the Senate seat to be vacated by Howard Baker. In making this announcement, the governor stressed that he did not want to divert legislative attention from his education proposal.

The January 28, 1983 Speech

Governor Alexander described his January 28 speech as "the most important proposal I will make in my eight years as governor." He highlighted the importance of his proposal by saying he would "oppose, campaign against, and veto any general tax increase that does not include the Better Schools Program."

In between these two statements, the governor delivered a message that included several notable features. An economic and job-oriented theme was repeated early in the address. He also said, "the Better Schools Program is not mine." "Credit" for the ideas in the proposal was given to several sources, primarily the Legislature's Task Force on Education which had late in 1982 completed a year long study of education in the state. The Task Force had included the 1982-83 president of the Tennessee Education Association (the Association which was soon to become the major organized opposition to Alexander's Master Teacher Plan), representatives from business, representatives from education, and representatives from other segments of the lay public. The actual extent of the carry-over from the task force's

Comprehensive Study of Education report is examined in Chapter IV of this study document.

The governor mentioned teacher salaries and the need to attract and keep highly qualified teachers. The Master Teacher Plan was described by Alexander as "an incentive pay system that will make teaching a fully professional career." He outlined the plan and gave examples of suggested salary changes. In the speech the governor said he had tried to satisfy each of the six concerns that the TEA president had shared with the legislative Task Force about extra pay for outstanding teachers.

In describing the implications of his plan, Alexander declared that "Master Teachers would be among the best and best paid public school teachers in the country in a statewide system." The plan, he stated, was protective of the pay, tenure, benefits, and jobs of the current teacher workforce.

The governor emphasized that "Tennessee will be the first in the country in terms of making public school teaching a truly professional career which both demands and rewards excellence." The fact that being first surfaced repeatedly as a sort of rallying cry to action makes it an important notion to keep in mind when

analyzing the events surrounding the governor's proposal and the deliberations that followed.

The Governor Publicizes His Program

After presenting his speech to the Press Association Governor Alexander set into motion a series of activities to publicize his proposals. Within 24 hours after the speech, he had traveled nearly 1000 miles across the state to meet with groups of educators. For five days the governor, accompanied on some stops by the State Commissioner of Education, Robert McElrath, continued traveling from one meeting to the next. An article in the Memphis Commercial Appeal (January 30, 1983) quoted Alexander as saying "I didn't stay home from the Senate to twiddle my thumbs".

After this first week of meetings with groups of educators, at least two more intensive weeks of speeches had been arranged. A Speaker's Bureau was established, which sent educators and other supporters of the governor to appear before various groups across the state to explain the Better Schools Program (D.L. Carlson, personal communication, January 5, 1983). A toll-free Hotline was established (announced during the January 28 speech) to receive inquiries and comments. A series of mailings was sent to a large segment of the public. The

State Department also sent explanatory mailings directly to teachers via bi-weekly newsletters. Selected audiences in and out of state were sent brochures and newspaper clippings about the program.

The publicity efforts were coordinated by a twelve-person task force (known by some as the SWAT Team) formed in mid-February. It consisted of six workers from the governor's re-election campaign, and six officials from various departments of state government. The group which was chaired by one of the governor's aides, Lewis Lavine, became controversial and was sharply reduced in size when the costs of their exclusive involvement with promoting Alexander's program became a public concern at a later point in the legislative session. Those who remained continued to devote their full time efforts to promotional, liaison, and information generating activities on behalf of the total Better Schools Program (D.L. Carlson, personel communication, January 5, 1984).

Another step in the governor's efforts to publicize the program and generate financial support was the creation of lobbying groups by the governor's assistants. One of the groups, designated PASS (People Advocating Superior Schools) also involved the Tennessee School Boards Association. PASS was fairly short-lived, reported in the media to have resulted in part from some

association members' objections to the organization's role in this enterprise. Another group, TBS (Tennesseans for Better Schools) experienced greater success. It grew to nearly 40,000 members and collected approximately \$400,000 from business leaders and other contributors. TBS constituted the largest lobby in the state. The funds it raised to pay for extensive advertising campaigns, travel, and other activities.

The steps that followed the presentation of the program suggest that the stage was being set for a major debate about the status of education in Tennessee. The next subsection of this chapter describes in greater detail the origins of the governor's program for creating an incentive pay system for the state's teachers. It describes the way in which the program was put together, and the publicity efforts which later became a point of contention by groups opposing the plan.

The Plan's Inception

When Governor Alexander announced his program and acknowledged several sources of the ideas it contained, only one source was given more than a passing mention. The source highlighted was the Comprehensive Education Study (Tennessee Comprehensive Education Study, 1982).

The governor also quoted from this Task Force report in his March 1, 1983 Budget Message to the legislature to show the Senate and House that they should take their rightful share of ownership of the program. He cited four specific passages mentioning: (1) an apprentice program for beginning teachers, supervised by "master teachers"; (2) higher average salaries for teachers; (3) finding ways of rewarding outstanding teachers "over and beyond their set salaries"; and (4) providing for a Master Teacher rank and for additional funds for outstanding teachers at all levels "to make the profession more competitive in the market place" (The Budget Message, 1983). Specific legislators who had been part of the Task Force were recognized and told to stand -- an action which may not have been appreciated by some of those persons involved. Alexander then re-emphasized his point by declaring that he had "tried to be not just a careful student of what I know the public wants, what I know is the right thing to do, but of precisely what this Legislature's Task Force recommended".

The roles of several important figures in the earliest phases of development of the governor's proposed Master Teacher Plan have not been widely discussed. Chester E. (Checker) Finn, Jr., Co-Director of Vanderbilt University's Institute for Public Policy Studies,

reported having advised the governor on educational matters since the latter part of 1982, and he continues to be a trusted advisor in this area (D.L. Carlson, personal communication, January 5, 1984).

Education Commissioner Robert McElrath has also consulted Finn on educational issues, and was himself involved in the initial discussion and background research for the governor's proposal. McElrath has claimed credit for the master teacher idea, stating that he had been nurturing and working toward the realization of this concept during the past twenty-five years. Several TEA publications (Bryant, 1983) also referred to the McElrath's longstanding role as an advocate of merit pay and an opponent of a "lock-step salary schedule".

The governor had also given his closest aides an integral role in the inception of the Master Teacher Plan. Bracey Campbell, Special Assistant to the governor, was assigned full time to the program, and had involvement in key discussions and planning sessions (D.L. Carlson, personal communication, January 5, 1984). Lewis Lavine, who headed up the 12 member "SWAT Team", had responsibility for many of the public relations aspects of the plan (D.L. Carlson, personal communication, January 5, 1984).

Keel Hunt, an aide to the governor who holds the office of Director of Policy Studies, observed that his conversations with Alexander about educational reform began in the Spring of 1982. Hunt attended meetings and reported to the governor on discussions in progress while the plan was being drafted (D.L. Carlson, personal communication, January 5, 1984).

Alexander was able to keep his program from public and even legislative scrutiny prior to his official announcement because it was contained within a group of select advisors and it utilized study reports in progress at the time. This "closed" approach proved to have both positive and negative effects in terms of early reaction and later moves by the legislators, teachers groups, and others who would be influenced by its implications.

CHAPTER IV

THE MASTER TEACHER PROPOSAL: EARLY RESPONSES

The First Week: Support and Criticism

Governor Alexander's announcement of his 10-point Better Schools Program was made in an atmosphere of speculation and anticipation. It received extensive statewide print and television coverage. Almost immediately, there was controversy. The conflict focused virtually exclusively on the tenth point of the Better Schools Program--the Master Teacher Plan.

The governor portrayed his program as one that had emerged from the deliberations of a Legislative Task Force and recommendations from business, higher education and various segments of the lay public. The TEA (Tennessee Education Association) opposed such portrayal. They said they had been excluded from involvement, and had received a copy of the program only three hours before the governor went public with his program on January 28 (Knoxville Journal, February 4, 1983).

With this conflict over the manner and timing of their notification, it is not surprising that a public disagreement arose. TEA had been placed in the position of either accepting or rejecting a program they had

virtually no time to examine. If they took a strong immediate position, they might need to make a major and possibly embarrassing turn-around. If they protested too loudly at having had no involvement, it could make people wonder why they had apparently been viewed by the Administration as not important enough to consult or not effective enough to deal with their lack of involvement. The position expressed by their president, James Booth, was probably the only viable strategy. He expressed TEA's support of the basic program, their willingness to help "sell it," and their reservations over the Master Teacher component as it appeared in the proposal. The organization's leaders were willing, said Booth, to sit down and try to resolve differences with the governor at any time (The Tennessean, January 30, 1983).

The "yes, but . . ." message delivered on behalf of the TEA was conveyed in press reports as support for the governor's program. The fact that it was qualified support did not attract much attention.

By February 4, 1983 TEA had sent a letter to each of its 38,000 members expressing opposition to the Master Teacher Plan. The letter detailed points of objection to the program in areas such as basic salaries for teachers, threats to tenure and

negotiations, and the quota provisions (10% limit for Master Teachers, 25% for Senior Teachers).

TEA expressed strong support for the governor's intent to seek increased tax revenues for education, but its leaders soon became disenchanted with the plan's anticipated effects on teacher rights and welfare. As late as January 30, 1983 the Knoxville News Sentinel indicated that "Alexander's plan to allow master teachers to evaluate other teachers for career promotions delighted the TEA board." Yet, a lengthy meeting of the TEA had prompted enough reservations for the board to prepare and distribute its critical letter to the entire TEA membership. Some persons indicated that their major complaints could be traced back to not having been consulted adequately in the development of the program. Others felt that TEA had actually been so adamant following the actual or perceived NEA position against all forms of merit pay that they had in effect "not wanted to be consulted" (Nashville Banner, July 8, 1983). This same news source reported that the governor was refused the opportunity to present his views in the TEA newspaper. Such an incident would suggest a stance quite different from the TEA president's stated confidence that the organization would be able to work with the administration to resolve their differences.

The TEA leadership did participate in several meetings with Commissioner McElrath and others. Therefore, the opportunity existed at least in principle for possible modifications in the program or future acceptance of some currently controversial features by the teachers' organization.

The Growing Controversy

While on his statewide speaking tour after announcing the Better Schools Program, the governor repeatedly fielded skeptical questions about the Master Teacher component from teachers. By February 4, 1983 Alexander remarked to a Chamber of Commerce meeting in Jackson, "Since when did we as a population turn over the responsibility for the public education system just to those who work for it?" (Nashville Banner, February 4, 1983). Several days later a remark by Commissioner McElrath caused further resentment among teachers. On February 9, he was quoted as declaring that prospective teachers come "from the bottom of the barrel" (The Tennessean, February 10, 1983). He was said to have made this statement to justify the quota or cap placed on Senior or Master Teacher selection, while meeting with the State Board of Education's Executive Committee. He subsequently denied that his actual words had been

correctly reported by the Nashville newspaper which carried the alleged remark. The reaction from the teachers' association was nonetheless swift and negative. Teachers were clearly frustrated, perceiving themselves as unappreciated as professionals.

While the conflict with the state's teachers was heating up, several other groups were coming forward in support of the program. The Tennessee School Boards Association declared its support and so did the Principals' Study Council. Margaret Taylor, chairman of the Principals' Study Council declared, "This is an exciting concept--bold, progressive, and brave. The principals are very excited . . . " (Nashville Banner, February 4, 1983). The Tennessee School Boards Association was later influential in establishing a statewide lobbying group known as People Advocating Superior Schools (PASS).

Early legislative reaction to the governor's plan was "mixed". The House Speaker and Lieutenant Governor (both Democrats) expressed their general approval of the concept but unwillingness to support a tax increase at that time. Other legislators said they liked some of the ideas, but not others. Legislators were summoned to the governor's office to hear his position personally and urged to support the program. Alexander appeared on

March 7, 1983 before the House and Senate education committees. He framed their task in terms of doing the right thing, and in essence voting their consciences rather than from a politically motivated position. The push to implement this program was seen by the governor as a type of crusade. Unless it was accepted, there would be, he vowed, no tax increase for any purpose. This hard sell may have worked with some legislators, but it appeared to bother others who felt that it was unwarranted and perhaps indicative of a plan too weak to stand on its own merits. Senate Democrats were particularly upset, both with the pressure being applied and with Alexander's failure to promptly present them with the legislation. It was not until February 24, 1983 that a draft bill was circulated among legislators. Chairpersons of the Senate and House Education Committees (Anna Belle O'Brien and Walter Work) received the drafts to be circulated among their colleagues for their reactions and suggestions. The governor's budget message (The Budget Message, 1983) had also been delayed (until March 1), leaving legislators without specific knowledge of the level and type of funding to be sought for the Better Schools Program. Senator O'Brien, a Democrat who had been persuaded to become an advocate of the governor's

education proposal, advised him of the growing conflict. She is quoted as saying, "I told him the senators aren't going to buy a pig in the poke. I told him the way to get his program beat is not to have the bills introduced (last week)" (Nashville Banner, February 2, 1983).

The Master Teacher Plan was presented as a bill on the last possible day to introduce new legislation, and it did encounter difficulty in the debates that followed.

From Proposal to Legislation

The governor's original proposal, as outlined in his January 28, 1983 address, underwent modification before being presented to the Legislature in final form on March 3, 1983. On the same day, TEA submitted its own bill, titled the Tennessee Teacher Excellence Program, arguing that their objections had not been satisfactorily attended to by Governor Alexander (Select Committee on Education, March 3, 1983).

In this section, an overview is presented of the two competing proposals and a third version of the plan which later emerged as a "Compromise Bill".

The six legislative sponsors of the Master Teacher Plan (two Democrats, four Republicans) made three major

changes in the original concept. The changes were: (1) to reduce the size of the State Certification Commission from 21 persons to 13 persons; (2) to give the Legislature power to provide 10- or 11- month options for the number of months a Master Teacher can choose to work, rather than just 12-month contracts; and (3) to add a try-out provision for teachers who might wish to drop out of the program in favor of the current tenure system.

With these changes, the sponsors claimed to have helped assure the fairness of the program. Alexander was reported by the media as stating that although he did not favor all changes made, he could accept the proposal as drafted.

Several features of the Tennessee Master Teacher program as proposed to the Legislature in early March are of particular interest. The program was to be optional for current teachers and optional for school systems. There was (at least for the first four years of the program) a quota on Senior or Master Teacher positions of about 35% of the state's teachers. There was to be no incentive pay at the two lower levels (Apprentice and Professional). Certification as a Senior or Master Teacher was to be subject to a five-year renewal decision by a State Certification

Commission. A panel of three Master Teachers was to be assigned to evaluate each applicant according to specific criteria that would be established through the State Department of Education.

Two days after the Administration's proposal was circulated in draft form and just a week before the filing deadline, TEA submitted an alternative bill. Their objections centered on: base salaries; evaluation; recertification and tenure; negotiations; quotas; morale; politics; and the lack of an Affirmative Action Plan. The TEA proposal dealt with the objections by suggesting such provisions as: a 10% across-the-board raise for all teachers with at least three years' experience and five years' college education; a 19-member Professional Education Certification Board, to include 12 teachers; a three year Intern/Provisional Stage prior to Professional Teacher status; and more control over teacher preparation programs.

By March 15, 1983, less than two weeks after the proposals were submitted to the Legislature, there was talk of delaying the program for a year. The Chairman of the House Finance, Ways and Means Committee was one of those suggesting that this cautious approach be taken.

Two days later, TEA made an announcement that put thoughts of caution or compromise into the background at that point. A formal stance against the Master Teacher Plan was taken, with President James Booth stating, "We would rather wind up with no plan at all than have the bill that has been introduced. The defeat of the bill that's presently in the hopper is a top priority." (The Tennessean, March 17, 1983). The intent of the declaration was apparently not as negative concerning the total plan (versus the legislative proposal itself) as the press release seemed to indicate. The poorly timed and possibly inaccurately reported statement coincided with the public announcement by several legislators of a Compromise Bill they had drafted.

This piece of legislation (Compromise Bill) reduced the size of the supplement for Senior and Master Teachers so that \$1,000 annual bonuses could be paid to those at the Professional level. Within several years, the opportunity would exist under this proposal for 87% (in contrast to 35%) of Tennessee's teachers to receive incentive pay. The sponsors said they would meet with TEA leaders and consider more changes if the changes could be agreed upon. They had not, however, consulted the TEA leaders directly as the compromise

proposal was developed. A number of the major TEA concerns were left unchanged, such as tenure and certification.

When asked if teachers would be giving up their tenure under this bill, Senate sponsor Steve Cobb was quoted as saying: "Yes and no; it is not a direct attack on tenure" ("Cobb offers," 1983). He went on to note that if one fails to obtain a certificate during a five-year review, "you'll have tenure but can't use it".

As discussion of the bills continued, meetings were held between the leading parties in the controversy. Pressure continued to be applied by both sides. For example, Governor Alexander decided to convene the Interim Certification Commission called for in his bill despite the fact that he had not yet received legislative endorsement of his plan. The Commission, which would deal with the evaluation process for teachers, was felt to play a crucial role in determining the eventual fairness and strength of the Master Teacher Plan. The political implications of the governor's action must also be considered in assessing the move. In word and action, Alexander tried to convince people that . . . "This is an idea whose

time has come and that time is about here." (The Tennessean, March 29, 1983).

Opponents of the program, and others who were merely concerned about specific features or implications, were not as certain about the inevitability of the governor's package. Financing for the program was a much discussed issue.

On April 13, 1983 the vote was taken in the Senate Education Committee to delay consideration of the bill by the Legislature until February, 1984. The decision was closely followed and intensely lobbied, with one member providing last-minute "suspense" as a swing vote. In the final analysis, the committee split on party lines. Up to that key vote, members of the Alexander Administration voiced optimism concerning the bill's passage. Although the initial confrontation did not result in the outcome anticipated by many, there would be another opportunity for each side to present its case.

The day after the Senate group's decision, Alexander said there would be no general tax increase and thus no pay raises for teachers or state employees. The House also acted quickly, passing a resolution that created a legislative study committee to further

consider the education plans (Select Committee on Education).

In less than three months, an intense campaign had been waged, with tremendous resources mobilized and public attention captured. The carryover seemed likely to last for at least several months beyond the April decision. In Chapter 5, the nature of that carryover is explored in depth.

CHAPTER V

THE MASTER TEACHER PROPOSAL: ACTIONS FOLLOWING DEFERRAL

General Reactions

Following defeat of the governor's Master Teacher Program in the Legislature, those who had helped shape the bill regrouped to continue their efforts. They studied why the legislation was deferred and prepared to restructure the education package for the 1984 legislative session.

Reactions to the deferred legislation, were varied. They ranged from continued support by the governor and mixed feelings in the legislature to direct opposition by TEA. These reactions formed the base of what was to become the most controversial and widely covered piece of legislation in Tennessee for that year.

The general mood of constituents, lay groups, and professionals across the state in early 1983 seemed to indicate that the public was ready to support educational reform in the state, but uncertain to what extent. The fact that the governor's program was first introduced in January and pushed for swift legislative

passage in April was disconcerting to many. Also, the public was cautious because of uncertainty on how the program would be funded. It would require either that additional taxes be imposed or that the present tax base be changed. The need for educational reform was not the issue. The question in many people's minds revolved around, "What kind of difference will this reform make in the schools?" and "What will the tax burden be on the people in Tennessee?"

Controversy: The Governor and TEA

TEA saw failure of the bill to be enacted as a victory. Their perspective was that the governor's program was seriously flawed. TEA involved teachers in the lobbying process and attempted to influence public opinion. The undertaking was massive, the message simple: the governor's plan is not workable. Persuading the press, the public, and the legislators that teachers were not in support of the program in its present form became a major focus of the TEA.

Governor Alexander began in the Spring of 1983 to face strong resistance from this organization, one of the state's most powerful lobbying groups. The governor's battle with the teacher's organization has been dramatized as one of the state's biggest political fights. When the 1983 Tennessee legislative session

adjourned, the governor was determined to find a way to have the Legislature pass his program in 1984.

The governor's perspective appeared to be "Master Teacher or nothing". TEA refused to endorse incentive pay and each group began to make decisions on how they would gain support for their view from teachers, media, legislators, and taxpayers. Both groups made strong accusations. The governor charged that (1) TEA was unwilling to compromise on a program that would benefit teachers in the state; and (2) They had misread his intent for developing and implementing a Master Teacher Program.

TEA charged that Alexander (1) Was trying to weaken the organized teaching profession through merit pay and other provisions of his Master Teacher Program; and (2) that the governor's veto of a 3% conditional pay raise for state employees was an act of revenge against teachers for not supporting his program ("Vetoes 'pure revenge'," 1983).

Subsequently, the Alexander administration and the teachers' association went their separate ways in campaign style efforts to fight for their respective views.

Legislative Reactions

Legislators appeared split in their support for the governor's program. Communication between supporters and others did not appear adequate. Two general observations can be made about the mixed support for the program: (1) There was genuine concern on the part of some who wanted to know what the Master Teacher legislation would accomplish; and (2) Some legislators appeared disinterested.

For the most part legislators were relieved that the issue was taken from them and given to the Select Committee on Education for study.

The governor was concerned about the reactions of many of the legislators following the legislative session. He made a concerted effort to talk with legislators who were either undecided or not in favor of his program. Much of his effort was directed at gaining support for the Legislature's Select Committee appointed to study his plan. The support of several legislators was won because of his efforts. Apart from the Select Committee on Education, similar attempts were made to gain the support of other legislators. The governor appointed an 18-member commission (Interim Commission) which would function as a part of the State

Department of Education to develop evaluative criteria to identify Master Teachers.

Several legislators asked questions concerning the circumstances under which such an unauthorized commission was approved and how the Commissioner of Education intended to fund it. The Commissioner defended his position by explaining that legislative leaders had requested such a commission based on a compromise made between Alexander's Master Teacher Program and TEA's Tennessee Teacher Excellence Bill. Also, funding had been appropriated by the Commissioner of Finance and Administration. Therefore, the governor had a functioning committee to develop evaluation criteria and teacher competencies for selecting Master Teachers. The vagueness of the evaluation process and criteria had been a point that TEA objected to as a major drawback in the original proposal. The governor now had a visible means of showing the public that he was improving his original plan so that it was workable and agreeable to teachers. He also had two representatives on the Commission who happened to be the president and past president of TEA, as well as the last four "Teachers of the Year".

Public Relations

A massive statewide public relations campaign was in the planning stages as of late Spring. The Commissioner of Education announced that every school in the state would be visited between September 1983 and January 1984.

A team (SWAT) was organized to travel throughout the state. Its primary purpose was to persuade teachers to accept the new program (a maximum of 35% of the state's teachers would be eligible for professional status).

In response to questions raised concerning the source of funding for the governor's public relations efforts, the Commissioner of Education revealed that only \$80,000 of state money had been used during the first six weeks of operation. The task force did not have a separate budget and was funded by the State Department of Education and the governor's office. In defense of spending state money for campaign business, a statement from one of the governor's aides indicated that the governor's task force was created to offer a different perspective from TEA's for the Legislature to consider in its next session (D.L. Carlson, personal communication, January 5, 1983).

The administration's campaign efforts aimed at the state's teachers were seen by TEA as an attempt to

undermine the teachers' association. They saw this as being accomplished by the Alexander Administration in several ways: (1) by creation of the SWAT team to visit schools all over the state; and (2) by the creation of a Teachers' Study Council which was to select teachers from each school system to represent the thoughts and views of those in that particular district. These teachers would also be asked to provide feedback about evaluation criteria being developed by the Interim Commission.

Eventually, the administration's effort to continually communicate with the state's 46,000 teachers became such an enormous job that the base of operation was moved from the governor's office to the State Department of Education. This office, housed in the State Department, became known as the Better Schools Office. It was staffed with secretaries, State Department personnel and the executive director of the Interim Commission. A toll free "Hotline" was established to answer incoming questions about the governor's program and a report was made available which listed and answered the most commonly asked questions (Better Schools Hotline, 1983).

Mailings were sent frequently to teachers' homes and schools as a constant reminder that the Master

Teacher Program was designed to reward the best teachers and that fair evaluation practices would be employed. Reassurance was provided that teachers would be involved in each step of the development and approval of the evaluation criteria. State Department personnel were sent from the Better Schools Office to various districts to work with the Teachers' Study Councils. The staff of the Better Schools Office distributed and explained the proposed evaluation criteria which had been developed by State Department staff with the aid of two researchers from Vanderbilt University. Each draft had the tentative approval of the Interim Commission.

Meanwhile, the governor and his staff planned campaign strategy for the Master Teacher Program. Alexander and two of his aides made numerous speeches and appearances around the state during the Fall of 1983. Approximately 80% of the aides' time was spent campaigning and working with the governor on his plan. Several bean suppers were held in Alexander's honor around the state to raise money for the cause. An interest group called Tennessee Taxpayers Association was one of several groups that lobbied for Alexander's program. Another lobby group, People Advocating Superior Schools (PASS), formed by the governor's

office and the Tennessee School Boards Association (TSBA), was created to support the program and was funded through private sources. It was disbanded within several months. The largest lobby group formed by the Alexander Administration was the Tennesseans for Better Schools organization. It had nearly 40,000 members and took credit for raising \$400,000. The lobby was composed of businessmen and other citizens who supported merit or incentive pay for teachers. To qualify as a member, an individual was obligated to either contribute money or sign a petition stating support for the governor's program. Much of the money raised was used to buy six commercial spots on television and air time on the radio for the governor.

As the governor, his staff, lobby groups and constituents worked at selling the program, the Select Committee on Education studied and revised the earlier deferred program draft for the following year's legislation.

TEA sat on the other side of the fence and watched, reacted, and responded both to Alexander's tactics and to questions raised by teachers all over the state. TEA obtained equal time on television for balanced coverage (free of charge). They declined to oppose the governor's program but instead used their

television time to address needs such as discipline, teacher training, remedial work for students, and moonlighting.

TEA's major asset in fighting for its version of what educational reform should be was its membership of 38,500 teachers. As the second largest lobby group in the state, they presented powerful opposition to the Master Teacher Program. The teachers' association kept teachers informed through home mailings and TEA NEWS (TEA's official publication).

TEA officials frequented Capitol Hill throughout the year. They testified before legislative committees, served on the Interim Commission, and met with the governor. TEA recognized that some type of education reform legislation would be likely to pass in 1984. Therefore, they directed their efforts toward supporting the alternative bill to Alexander's Master Teacher Program which was presented to the Legislature on March 3, 1983.

Throughout the Spring and Fall of 1983, the stage was set for what was to become the most historic legislative session in Tennessee. With Alexander determined to see his Master Teacher Program passed at all costs, TEA convinced the program was designed to

destroy tenure and negotiations, the 1984 legislative session promised to be exciting.

Chapter VI of this study document describes the major groups involved in and contributing to the pending legislative decisions.

CHAPTER VI

KEY GROUPS IN PROGRAM FORMATION

Overview

Several major groups gained public attention during 1983 because of their involvement in or reaction to the Master Teacher Program. These groups (Select Committee on Education, State Department of Education, Interim Commission, Teachers' Study Council, and Tennessee Education Association all influenced the form of the bill that would go to the Legislature in 1984. TEA, the official teachers' association representing teachers' and administrators' interests; and the State Department of Education were the only two groups established and functioning in the state prior to the program's inception. The Select Committee on Education was a legislative group created by Governor Alexander in April 1983. This Committee was appointed to study the Master Teacher Program and the Tennessee Teacher Excellence Program and make recommendations for an education reform bill that could be enacted in 1984. The Interim Commission was also appointed by the governor during the 1983 legislative session. Its responsibility was to develop the criteria and instruments that would be used in the governor's new

program to evaluate teachers and administrators. The Teachers' Study Council was organized by the State Department of Education for the purpose of providing teacher feedback about the evaluation system being developed.

The relationship of these groups to one another is an interesting focus of study. The Interim Commission was responsible to the Commissioner of Education in the State Department of Education. Although the Commission had no enactment power, it was responsible for developing the proposed program's evaluation criteria and instrumentation -- one of the most controversial aspects of the governor's plan. Based on information received from various consultants, the Office of Research and Development (R&D), and the four subcommittees of the Interim Commission, Dr. Russell French, Executive Director of the Interim Commission, prepared reports to advise the Commissioner of Education and the Select Committee on Education on the status of the evaluation proceedings. The Select Committee on Education consulted regularly with members of the State Department and Interim Commission, hearing testimony from many of the same consultants used by the State Department.

In an effort to involve teachers in the program's development, the Teachers' Study Council was organized by the State Department of Education. The Better Schools Office, located in the State Department, monitored the activities of the seventeen area councils around the state and provided them with information concerning development of the evaluation process. A key staff member in the Better Schools Office was the Executive Director of the Interim Commission, Dr. Russell French, whose responsibility it was to develop the materials sent to teachers and respond to the information returned from the council meetings.

Another key group was the Tennessee Education Association (TEA) which represented 38,500 members of the state's teaching force of approximately 46,000. TEA separated itself from the Alexander Administration to maintain its role as the leading advocate of teachers' rights. During 1983, this distance between TEA and the Alexander Administration was at times exaggerated. Until Fall 1983, the adversarial mood prevailed. At that time, TEA president Marjorie Pike stated publicly that she thought a compromise was possible.

The following subsections provide an overview of each key group's roles, responsibilities and

involvement in the year's most hotly debated issue -- the Master Teacher Program.

The Select Committee on Education

Senate Joint Resolution 96 Study Committee, more commonly known as the Select Committee on Education, was under assignment to develop a comprehensive educational reform package for consideration by the 1984 Legislature.

The assignment involved more than conducting research on the topic, finding a means of financing it, and hiring experts to refine the proposal. The Master Teacher Plan introduced to the public by Alexander in January of 1983 was part of a ten-point Better Schools Program -- a longer and more comprehensive educational reform package. Although the original proposal did not pass the Legislature, the Better Schools Program was a major factor to be considered in the Select Committee's recommendations concerning educational reform.

For several years there had been national recognition of a need to improve the nation's public education system. Studies done in other states and attempts at reform gave the Committee opportunity to compare plans in Tennessee to those in other states. The Committee consulted experts in other states who

were involved in similar programs to help put into perspective some possible pitfalls and to gather information upon which to base future recommendations. The Select Committee on Education faced constant pressure to make sure their task was done by January, 1984 because several other states were already frontrunners in the race to first enact state-wide educational reform.

The Committee was organized into three subcommittees, each to study a different aspect of the educational process. The three subcommittees (Teacher Compensation, Instructional Development, Teacher Training) conducted research in their respective areas of study, obtained necessary information on which to base discussions/decisions, brought in experts to testify, and made recommendations for adoption by the full committee. The State Department of Education, including the Interim Commission, and the Governor's Office were major resources for the Committee in helping to locate people and information needed to complete the study.

The Teacher Compensation Subcommittee studied the pros and cons of both a single salary schedule and differentiated salary schedules. Presently, the Tennessee system is based on a single salary schedule,

so emphasis was placed on the study of merit pay and incentive pay. Dr. Susan Rosenholtz, a researcher from Vanderbilt University, was commissioned to submit a formal paper on teacher compensation (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1983). Based on this research and testimonies from people working with similar projects (Linda Bond, California General Assembly; Virginnia Koehler, National Institute of Education), the Teacher Compensation Subcommittee made recommendations to be considered in the development of a merit pay system. A primary concern of this Subcommittee's acceptance of a merit or incentive pay system was the issue of paying teachers more for "what" they teach than "how" they teach. Based on this concern, it was proposed that the creation of the new system include a means for developing the classroom skills of all teachers. This could, in part, be accomplished by having the "master" teachers serve as role-models for the beginning teachers. Staff development programs would be a must in helping to improve beginning teachers' skills and provide help for candidates who were unsuccessful in their attempt to climb the career ladder.

The Teacher Training Subcommittee addressed concerns regarding graduation requirements, institution accreditation, certification, and other issues

involving prospective teachers and their training through the first year of teaching. The Subcommittee expressed the opinion that without a substantial increase in the attractiveness of the teaching career, upgrading of certification and graduation requirements could be potentially detrimental to teacher education programs.

In the midst of recommendations made in changing policy for components of teacher training and certification, admission standards to institutions of higher education remained virtually unchanged with the exception of requiring students to pass a standardized composition test. Although there was concern over the fact that the score on the National Teacher's Exam (NTE) was the only criterion used for certification after successful completion of coursework and student teaching, the Subcommittee decided not to change the policy at this time. A recommendation was made to develop and implement a state exit exam that would be more closely related to Tennessee's certification needs/requirements by 1986.

The Subcommittee recommended that prospective teachers begin classroom observations/experiences in the freshman year. Upon successful graduation from a state accredited teacher training institution and

attainment of a passing score on the state exit exam, one year of teaching as a probationary teacher would be required prior to certification. Successful completion of all these requirements would be necessary for certification and entry into the Career Ladder Program. Many concerns have been expressed regarding Tennessee's policy on becoming certified to teach in endorsement areas other than those initially trained and certified in. The Subcommittee recommended that the procedure for adding endorsements to present certification become more rigorous. College credits for add-on endorsements would be comparable to those needed for initial endorsements, to include one additional college course every 5 years.

The Subcommittee's study of the accreditation process involving Tennessee's teacher training institutions brought up a controversial issue. Testimonies from various people before the Subcommittee revealed that there were differences in opinion on how to impose higher accreditation standards. Presently, only ten institutions are accredited by NCATE in Tennessee. To impose this standard on all teacher training institutions would literally put all but the ten universities in the state out of commission. A dilemma arises when, as a result of new educational

reform, the state is looking for better ways to upgrade its institutions and at the same time runs the risk of eliminating the source. The Subcommittee's alternative was to recommend that in order to be an accredited teacher training institution, seventy percent of the institution's graduates would have to pass the State Teacher Examination. Failure to comply with the mandate for two consecutive years would result in the institution losing its accreditation.

The Instructional Development Subcommittee worked from the premise that a considerable amount of a teacher's training occurs after graduation from college. With this in mind, it was their task to recommend improvements for teacher in-service training. Specific recommendations can be found in the Select Committee's Report on Education (Report of the Select Committee on Education, 1984).

Research indicates that a high rate of attrition occurs in the first four years of teaching. Addressing this matter, the Subcommittee recommended that special attention be given to Probationary and Apprentice Teachers in the in-service system. In terms of content and allocation of time, stricter rules would be imposed upon each school system in using in-service training as a means of improving teacher skills. Also, in an effort

to bridge the gap between public school systems and institutions of higher education, it was recommended that by 1985, all full-time college of education faculty be required to participate in the school system through personal involvement in the classroom.

The State Department of Education

The State Department of Education played an important part in facilitating the development of many segments of the Master Teacher Program. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. Robert McElrath, worked closely with the governor throughout the year. He delegated many of the tasks to be completed for the program to various departments and individuals within the State Department.

The majority of activity involving the Master Teacher Program involved three offices within the State Department: (1) the Commissioner's Office; (2) the Better Schools Office; and, (3) the Office for Research and Development. However, other personnel were on call as needed to make sure all work for the Master Teacher Program took first priority. As in the governor's office, many staff were taken from their regular duties and reassigned to work on the proposal to ensure that details for the new program were taken care of. In

addition to the extra duties regarding the Master Teacher Program, State Department staff were expected to fulfill their routine responsibilities as well as possible. There is no official record of how many persons were asked to devote time to tasks associated with the program.

The Better Schools Office became the center of operation for the Master Teacher Program when the operations were moved from the governor's office in early 1983. From this office, mailings were sent out statewide with information and publicity about the Program and the evaluation component; the Teachers' Study Council chapters were monitored; a toll-free Hotline answered questions from the public about the program; and duplication materials for other operations concerning the Interim Commission were based here.

The Office for Research and Development (R&D) was used for its expertise in tests and measurements. There were three staff members in this office who devoted most of their time to the program towards the end of the Summer and into the Fall of 1983 (Dr. Joy McLarty, Dr. Carol Furtwengler, and Dr. George Malo). This staff had the responsibility for developing an evaluation instrument and field testing it. The Office of Research and Development also hired consultants who were experts

in developing evaluation criteria and field testing evaluation instruments. No one evaluation method or test was implemented. Rather, a combination of several techniques was used in developing the materials. The R&D staff continued to work with the program as the instruments were refined.

Many duties within the State Department were handled on an "ad hoc" basis concerning the Master Teacher Program. When something needed to be done, the person who was qualified to do it was taken from his/her regular duties and reassigned to the task. When money was needed to hire a consultant or pay an unexpected expense, the commissioner found a means to fund it -- and it got done.

Ad Hoc Interim Certification Commission

In April 1983 the Interim Commission convened for its organizational meeting. With a year's budget of \$40,000, to include all expenses, it can be questioned whether the Commission was meant to survive or even function effectively. The Ad Hoc Interim Certification Commission was given its name because of the timing of its appointment. When the governor's Master Teacher/Administrator Program failed to be enacted in 1983, how to appoint a group to continue the plan's

development became a technicality to resolve'. Therefore, the term "Ad Hoc" was used. It was also stipulated that members of the Commission could not be paid. The 18-member Commission is a select group of people representative of the community at large and appointed by the governor to work under the auspices of the State Department in developing an evaluation system for the proposed Master Teacher/ Administrator Program (Career Ladder Program, as it is now called).

Subcommittee assignments were made prior to the organizational meeting by the executive director, subject to change if a member assigned was unduly dissatisfied with his/her assignment. As it turned out, several members asked to be moved to subcommittees of their choice, resulting in differences within each group concerning leadership and the decision process within the subcommittee. Of the four subcommittees (Applications, Interviews, Portfolio, Competencies and Other Criteria), members of the Competencies and Other Criteria Sub-Committee openly argued/discussed each item on the agenda resulting in slow and tedious decision making. Because of the make-up of these sub-committees, open debate was inevitable between representatives of TEA, the State Department and others. The other sub-committees talked briefly about

agenda items, voted, and in general, completed their tasks efficiently and with minimum debate.

Prior to the organizational meeting of the Interim Commission, Dr. Susan Rosenholtz, an assistant professor at Vanderbilt University, and Mark Smylie, her assistant, were contracted by the State Department through Vanderbilt to provide current research on effective teaching, student achievement, classroom management and planning, and effective instructional behavior. Their research summary was used by the Commission to identify teacher competencies on which the evaluation instrument for the new program could be developed. Throughout the Spring and Summer of 1983, Rosenholtz and Smylie continued to assist the Commission and submitted formal papers on the research being done. In the Fall of 1983, initial drafts of teacher competencies, to be used as the basis for teacher evaluation, were sent out to the Teachers' Study Council so they could receive input from teachers. Based on reaction from teachers, TEA and many members of the Interim Commission, it was decided to seek information on other research in the field of teacher effectiveness and evaluation, and consult with other experts in the field before finalizing these competencies. An effort was made to broaden the

research base from which the competencies were identified and the evaluation instrument developed. Consultants were asked to address the Interim Commission about teacher effectiveness and about development of an evaluation instrument that was fair, feasible to administer, time efficient and non-political.

During this time, Rosenholtz and the Interim Commission disagreed on what research should serve as the basis for the competencies and evaluation instrument. The Commission questioned if the research Rosenholtz presented was the only credible research in the field. Rosenholtz insisted that her research was the best. The Interim Commission wanted to consult other experts in the field for advice. Disagreement resulted between the two parties and Rosenholtz resigned in December of 1983. The Commission used the research of Rosenholtz and Smylie as one source of information because it was thorough, well written, and documented. However, they also sought advice from other experts.

The disagreement between Rosenholtz and the Interim Commission was only one of several. Throughout the eight months of meetings in 1983, representatives of TEA (Marjorie Pike, president; James Booth, past

president) fought for the right of teachers to study draft materials and submit their input at each step along the way. Unfortunately for teachers, there was not enough time to send materials to the representative Teachers' Study Councils, allow review, reaction and input time, process this information at the State Department of Education and act upon it in the Commission meetings more than two times. The deadline for completion of the evaluation instruments had been established in December in order to be ready for the field testing deadline. Even the Interim Commission had minimal opportunity to review the final criteria for the evaluation instruments. The Commission was asked to give tentative approval to the criteria in December for field testing. Their approval was made contingent upon the promise of State Department personnel that there would be further opportunity for revision after field testing. Both teachers from the Teachers' Study Council and representatives of TEA were dissatisfied with the lack of sufficient opportunity to adequately review and revise criteria for the evaluation instruments prior to field testing. Other Commission members seemed comfortable with the decision to field test the instruments in their present form.

During the Fall, several people testified before the Commission and consultants were hired to present several views from which the Commission could choose in developing the evaluation instrument. The Interim Commission did not actually develop the instrument, nor did it meet with many of the consultants. For the most part, members of the Commission did not have the background in research and statistics to accomplish the task of designing the instrument, nor did they have the time and resources to spend traveling to Nashville to meet with the consultants on a regular basis. As a result, the task of developing the instrument was delegated to staff members in the Office for Research and Development in the State Department and the responsibility of selecting and meeting with consultants fell to the Executive Director of the Interim Commission, the Commissioner of Education, and selected staff from Research and Development. In December, a draft of the instrumentation was pronounced ready for field testing early in 1984.

Teachers' Study Council

The Teachers' Study Council was organized in late Summer and early Fall, 1983 by the State Department of Education. Subdivided into seventeen area groups with numerous local councils in each area, the Teachers'

Study Council was designed to parallel the structure of existing Superintendents' and Supervisors' Study Councils in the state. The purposes of the Tennessee Teachers' Study Council were established in the group's Constitution and By-Laws. They pertain to: continued opportunities for teachers to study and communicate their views; involvement of teachers in the decision making process; dissemination of information on educational issues; and participation in professional growth activities (Constitution and By-Laws, 1983).

Until the inception of this group there had not been a statewide forum for teachers comparable to those available to other educational personnel. The lack of a formal mechanism for receiving feedback from teachers was a concern of many people during debate over the Master Teacher Plan. Non-members or teachers who disagreed with TEA's stance did not have an organizational structure to exchange and publicize their views. One rationale for creation of the Teachers' Study Council was to provide such an opportunity.

A number of factors related to procedures and activities, as reported by officers and members of a number of area and local councils, could be construed as supporting the view that there was some difference

between the actual and espoused importance of these groups (J. R. Handler, personal communication, January, 1984). Procedures for selecting local council members were inconsistent. They were typically based on nomination by school administrators. Local council officers often did not have up-to-date lists of members. Very little time was given during meetings, and seldom any in advance, to study the lengthy lists of evaluative criteria or other detailed materials which members were expected to react to at specific meetings. Opportunities for discussion at meetings were severely limited by time constraints. These difficulties may have been attributable to the council being a newly formed organization. However, a number of council members seemed frustrated with the hurried pace of deliberations. The fact that so much of the teacher input was solicited through written responses to the Better Schools Office made some teachers feel that their voice might not be "heard". Despite these concerns, Teachers' Study Council representatives continued to attend area meetings and seek further information and input about the proposed Master Teacher Program. Council meetings provided a badly-needed structure for two-way communication between teachers and State Department representatives. The potential

rewards to both groups were great enough to merit a sincere effort to make the Council "work".

Tennessee Education Association

The Tennessee Education Association (TEA) is the major organization representing the state's teachers. Thirty eight thousand of the state's 46,000 teachers belong to the Association. TEA president James Booth ended his one-year term June 30, 1983 as Marjorie Pike assumed the presidency. Both officers represented TEA on the Interim Commission.

The Association's Board of Directors in January discussed the governor's program and how the Association could best inform its members of TEA's position. Following the governor's televised education message on January 28 and a question-answer session with TEA's 20-member Board of Directors a decision was made by the Board to send its membes, as soon as possible, a letter outlining TEA's position in regard to the governor's new proposal for educational reform. It also vowed to help sell a tax increase to fund the reform, but there were some points of contention. Among these were concerns over criteria to be used in evaluation, quotas that would limit supplements to only one-third of the state's teachers and effects on the present salary schedule and tenure. Additionally, TEA

insisted that the state's teachers should receive an across the board pay increase, which Alexander had not included as part of his program.

By February 2, TEA shifted its position of general support for the governor's program in its original form to one of greater opposition. In an effort to inform members of its position, the Association sent its teachers a mailing stating the Association's view. By March 3, TEA had come up with its own version of a bill aimed at educational reform (Tennessee Teacher Excellence Program, 1983). They introduced the alternative plan because: (1) the Alexander Administration had failed to change several points in the Master Teacher Plan that TEA found unacceptable; (2) many legislators who were not in favor of the governor's program advocated an alternate plan and; (3) members of the Association seemed very supportive of the alternate plan.

The Teachers' Association supported their "Tennessee Teacher Excellence Program" while Alexander held firm to his Master Teacher Program.

The TEA bill was sponsored by Representative Jim McKinney (D-Nashville) and Senator Riley Darnell (D-Clarksville). TEA's bill addressed five major areas: (1) entering the profession; (2) certification; (3)

evaluation; (4) financing; and (5) community involvement. Each of these areas related to a goal that defined the program, complete with objectives to carry out each of the goals. The goals for the Tennessee Teacher Excellence Program were stated as:

1. To assure that only persons with demonstrated abilities and aptitudes will enter and graduate from teacher training programs;
2. To enhance the quality of classroom instruction by assuming that only competent teachers and administrators will remain in the profession;
3. To make the evaluation process a more effective tool for improving classroom instruction;
4. To attract and retain competent persons in the teaching profession by compensating each one of them better financially and;
5. To improve education by increasing cooperation and communication between schools and communication between schools and communities.

TEA's rationale in its proposed legislation was an attempt to preserve strong points presently in the profession, continue to move ahead in improvements for teachers and other educators without penalizing teachers now in the profession, and insure future security for the state's educators.

On April 15, 1983 the Senate Education Committee voted to delay action on the Master Teacher Bill until 1984. TEA had scored at least a temporary victory.

Alexander's reactions to postponement of his program were immediate. Not only would the governor continue to fight for his Master Teacher Program, but he also refused to give teachers a pay raise for the year. This, too, would be postponed for consideration until the following year. TEA viewed Alexander's action as petty and at the sacrifice of teachers, the group of people his program was designed to help.

In a continuing effort to gain support, TEA sought the help of the National Education Association (NEA), also an opponent of Alexander's program. NEA's position opposed any program based on subjective evaluation in the absence of clearly defined criteria. NEA offered to give technical and financial assistance to state and local affiliates in the position of having to confront

merit pay plans. Mary Futrell, who became NEA president September 1, pledged her full support for TEA.

Evaluation was apparently not as much of an issue to TEA as the Alexander administration seemed to think it was. TEA said they were in support of evaluation, but unsure as to how, when, and by whom it would be done under the new Master Teacher Program ("Teacher Evaluation", May 16, 1983). Twelve rules were presented as agreed upon by the Tennessee School Boards Association (TSBA) and TEA regarding fair evaluation practice. Major points covered in these rules included the importance of evaluations being conducted by local school management, that the responsibility of certification and evaluation should be distinctly separate, and that evaluation should be based on job expectancy and job performance.

Although the Master Teacher Program and the Tennessee Teacher Excellence Program were being studied in dept by the Select Committee on Education, other options were also considered. The Committee sought other reform ideas that might offer a means of developing an acceptable plan. After three months of deliberating on various options and discussing concerns with both TEA and Alexander, the Select Committee on Education began the task of developing the plan. Based

on communication with the Select Committee on Education and a willingness to try for compromise, TEA's new president, Marjorie Pike, stated that she felt there was a good chance that a plan could be developed that would be acceptable to all groups concerned. For such a plan to work, six major points, presented in the Comprehensive Evaluation Task Force's Minority Report (Report of the Select Committee on Education, 1984), would have to be addressed: (1) The base salary of teachers in Tennessee is not adequate. The salary factor would have to be addressed and remedied before any other special rewards could be considered. (2) A quota should not be placed on the number of teachers and administrators receiving the rewards after they have met the criteria for acceptance. All who are eligible should receive the rewards. (3) Objective criteria for evaluating outstanding performance would be unconditional and measures must be taken to prohibit the influence of political forces and favoritism in the evaluation process. (4) The state must take responsibility for the extra funding needed and expected as a result of such a program. A review committee procedure would need to be built into the program as a safeguard against undue political influence. (6) Teachers and administrators should play

an integral part in the development and implementation of the program.

Negotiations throughout the Fall led to TEA's support of the Career Ladder (new form of educational reform package) contingent upon: (1) a significant across-the-board pay raise for teachers; (2) a reduction in pupil-teacher ratio; (3) an objective evaluation procedure and; (4) protection of teacher rights ("Select Committee Defers", November 15, 1983). The year ended without a compromise and left TEA in the position of bargaining with proponents of the Career Ladder Program in the Alexander Administration for a program it could support and recommend to its teachers.

CHAPTER VII

ANALYSIS OF NEWSPAPER COVERAGE

Purpose

From the time Governor Alexander delivered his speech to the people of Tennessee concerning the Better Schools Program, considerable media attention was focused on the proposals it contained, including the Master Teacher Plan. With twelve major newspapers representing 8 cities and the Tennessee Press Association (TPA) representing several of the smaller towns, coverage of the topic came from varied points of view. An analysis of reporting patterns across papers seemed appropriate in putting newspaper coverage of the Master Teacher Program into perspective. This analysis is a means of determining the position, if any, that each paper has taken and how the various developments and issues were covered. It is important to note that results from such an analysis are indicative, not conclusive, of individual newspaper representation of the subject.

Procedure

Selection of newspapers to be used for the analysis of newspaper coverage on the Master Teacher

Program was based on representation of: Tennessee's three largest cities: Nashville, Memphis, and Knoxville; three of its middle sized cities: Chattanooga, Kingsport, and Johnson City; two of its smaller cities: Jackson and Bristol; and several towns not specifically named but categorized under the Tennessee Press Association (TPA). The sample used for this analysis (see Appendix for specific names of newspapers) comprised a random selection of articles taken from approximately 1,300 articles beginning in January and continuing through December, 1983. The procedure for random selection involved choosing every seventh article from a stack of about 1,300 articles representing the 13 papers. The sample of 188 articles was read and analyzed across twenty-six categories.

To recap, the analysis was based on seven general categories: 1.) By-line; 2.) Topic: bill, process, reactions, financing, public relations, evaluation; 3.) Groups: governor, legislature, Select Committee, State Department, Interim Commission, TEA; 4.) Position: pro, con, neutral; 5.) Title: appropriate, inappropriate; 6.) Coverage: indepth, moderate, limited; 7.) Time Period: January-March, April-June, July-September, October-December.

The set of categories used in analyzing the newspaper articles was developed to portray key features of content and presentation. The 26 factors within these categories included: By-line, Bill, Process, Reactions, Financing, Public Relations, Evaluation, Governor, Legislature, Select Committee, State Department, Interim Commission, Tennessee Education Association (TEA), Other Organizations, Position (Pro, Con, Neutral), Title (Appropriate, Inappropriate), Coverage (Indepth, Moderate, Limited), Time Period (January-March, April-June, July-September, October-December). A check mark in the category By-line meant that a specific name (i.e. editor, columnist, staff person) was used with the article as opposed to it being a product from the Associated Press or other wire service. The Process category was used if the article described actions and events that affected the development of the Master Teacher Program during the year. The Reactions category involved coverage of how various groups and organizations responded to the governor's program. Financing involved the issue of restructuring the tax base and/or imposing additional taxes to support the program. The governor and his constituents' efforts to generate support for the program constituted the Public Relations factor. The

Evaluation component (i.e. development of, by whom, field testing, implementation) and how it evolved constituted another category. Articles focusing on action taken by the Governor, Legislature, Select Committee, State Department, Interim Commission and TEA, or issues involving these groups directly, were tallied in their respective categories. Articles dealing with groups, organizations and individuals different from the above were tallied under the Other Organizations category. Each article was assessed in terms of the stance taken relative to the Master Teacher Plan - pro, con, or neutral. In addition, the relationship of the article's title to its content was judged either Appropriate or Inappropriate. The extent to which a particular subject was analyzed, put into perspective and given detailed treatment determined whether it was marked as having Indepth, Moderate, or Limited coverage. The articles were also divided into four groups representing publication dates of: January-March, April-June, July-September, October-December.

A matrix was developed (refer to Tables I, II) to record information from each article according to how it covered the Master Teacher Program across the 26 factors. Supplementary notes were recorded as the

Table 1: Percent of Articles from Each News Source
Exhibiting the Various Features Analyzed

Newspaper Analysis

	Chattanooga News Free Press	Chattanooga Times	Kingsport Times News	Knoxville Journal	Knoxville News Sentinel	Jackson Sun	Memphis Press Scimitar	Bristol Herald Courier	Memphis Commercial Appeal	Johnson City Press Chronicle	Tennessee Press Association	Nashville Banner	Nashville Tennessean
By Line	36.8	92.9	79.2	63.6	60.0	58.3	33.3	33.3	45.0	61.9	52.9	63.6	100.0
Bill	63.1	57.1	45.8	72.7	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	60.0	42.9	64.7	63.6	60.0
Process	0.0	0.0	4.2	9.1	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	6.7
Reactions	36.8	21.4	33.3	27.3	26.7	50.0	66.6	33.3	35.0	9.5	41.2	36.4	20.0
Financing	21.1	14.3	12.5	9.1	6.7	8.3	0.0	33.3	10.0	14.3	29.4	9.1	20.0
Pub. Relations	10.5	21.4	4.2	18.2	20.0	8.3	33.3	0.0	5.0	14.3	11.8	18.2	20.0
Evaluation	10.5	7.1	8.3	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	18.2	13.3
Governor	21.1	35.7	29.2	36.4	33.3	50.0	33.3	33.3	30.0	23.8	41.2	27.3	20.0
Legislature	52.6	7.1	12.5	27.3	20.0	8.3	33.3	33.3	20.0	28.6	17.6	18.2	26.7
Select Comm.	0.0	7.1	8.3	9.1	20.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
State Dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Interim Comm.	0.0	7.1	8.3	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	6.7
TEA	26.3	14.3	25.0	45.5	20.0	58.3	0.0	33.3	25.0	33.3	29.4	54.5	40.0
Other Organizs.	31.6	35.7	37.5	27.3	26.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	35.0	42.9	35.3	54.5	40.0
Pro Position	21.1	50.0	50.0	81.8	53.3	50.0	66.6	16.7	35.0	57.1	29.4	54.5	20.0
Con Position	31.6	14.3	29.2	18.2	20.0	16.7	33.3	33.3	45.0	23.8	23.5	18.2	20.0
Neutral Position	47.4	35.7	20.8	0.0	26.7	33.3	0.0	50.0	20.0	19.0	47.1	27.3	60.0
Title Approp.	73.7	78.6	70.8	72.7	66.7	66.7	100.0	100.0	65.0	76.2	88.2	90.9	66.7
Title Inapprop.	26.3	21.4	29.2	27.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	35.0	23.8	11.8	9.1	33.3
Indepth Cov.	10.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	6.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	20.0	4.8	0.0	9.1	26.7
Moderate Cov.	31.6	78.6	54.2	45.5	46.7	58.3	33.3	66.6	50.0	42.9	52.9	63.6	33.3
Limited Cov.	57.9	21.4	45.8	45.5	46.7	41.7	66.6	16.7	30.0	52.4	47.1	27.3	40.0
Jan.-Mar., 1983	5.3	21.4	20.8	45.5	33.3	33.3	66.6	50.0	20.0	9.5	29.4	18.2	6.7
April-June, 1983	10.5	14.3	54.2	27.3	0.0	25.0	33.3	16.7	30.0	33.3	11.8	18.2	26.7
July-Sept., 1983	47.4	42.9	12.5	0.0	40.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	25.0	28.6	29.4	45.5	40.0
Oct.-Dec., 1983	36.8	21.4	12.5	27.3	26.7	8.3	0.0	16.7	25.0	28.6	29.4	18.2	26.7
N	19	14	24	11	15	12	3	6	20	21	17	11	15

Total Sample = 188

Table 2: Percent of Articles Across News Sources
Exhibiting Each Feature Analyzed

Newspaper Analysis

	Chattanooga News Free Press	Chattanooga Times	Kingsport Times News	Knoxville Journal	Knoxville News Sentinel	Jackson Sun	Memphis Press Scimitar	Bristol Herald Courier	Memphis Commercial Appeal	Johnson City Press Chronicle	Tennessee Press Association	Nashville Banner	Nashville Tennessean	N
By Line	5.0	11.0	16.1	5.9	7.6	5.9	.85	1.7	7.6	11.0	7.6	5.9	12.7	118
Bill	11.5	7.7	10.6	7.7	9.6	3.8	.96	1.9	11.5	8.7	10.6	6.7	8.6	104
Process	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	8
Reactions	12.1	5.2	13.8	5.2	6.9	10.3	3.4	3.4	12.1	3.4	12.1	6.9	5.2	58
Financing	14.3	7.1	10.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.0	7.1	7.1	10.7	17.9	3.6	10.7	28
Pub. Relations	8.3	12.5	4.2	8.3	12.5	4.2	4.2	0.0	4.2	12.5	8.3	8.3	12.5	24
Evaluation	16.7	8.3	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	12
Governor	6.9	8.6	12.1	6.9	8.6	10.3	1.7	3.4	10.3	8.6	12.1	5.2	5.2	58
Legislature	23.2	2.3	7.0	7.0	7.0	2.3	2.3	4.7	9.3	13.9	7.0	4.7	9.3	43
Select Comm.	0.0	11.1	22.2	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9
State Dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3
Interim Comm.	0.0	12.5	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	8
TEA	8.5	3.4	10.2	8.5	5.1	11.9	0.0	3.4	8.5	11.9	8.5	10.2	10.2	59
Other Organizs.	8.9	7.5	13.4	4.5	6.0	6.0	1.5	1.5	10.4	13.4	8.9	8.9	8.9	67
Pro Position	4.9	8.5	14.6	11.0	9.8	7.3	2.4	1.2	8.5	14.6	6.1	7.3	3.7	82
Con Position	12.5	4.2	14.6	4.2	6.3	4.2	2.1	4.2	18.8	10.4	8.3	4.2	6.3	48
Neutral Position	15.5	8.6	8.6	0.0	6.9	6.9	0.0	5.2	6.9	6.9	13.8	5.2	15.5	58
Title Approp.	9.9	7.8	12.1	5.7	7.1	5.7	2.1	4.3	9.2	11.3	10.6	7.1	7.1	141
Title Inapprop.	10.6	6.4	14.9	6.4	10.6	8.5	0.0	0.0	14.9	10.6	4.3	2.1	10.6	47
Indepth Cov.	13.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	26.7	6.7	0.0	6.7	26.7	15
Moderate Cov.	6.4	11.7	13.8	5.3	7.4	7.4	1.1	4.3	10.6	9.6	9.6	7.4	5.3	94
Limited Cov.	13.9	3.8	13.9	6.3	8.9	6.3	2.5	1.3	7.6	13.9	10.1	3.8	7.6	79
Jan.-Mar., 1983	2.4	7.1	11.9	11.9	11.9	9.5	4.8	7.1	9.5	4.8	11.9	4.8	2.4	40
April-June, 1983	4.3	4.3	28.3	6.5	0.0	6.5	2.2	2.2	13.0	15.2	4.3	4.3	8.7	46
July-Sept., 1983	16.1	10.7	5.4	0.0	10.7	7.1	0.0	1.8	8.9	10.7	8.9	8.9	10.7	56
Oct.-Dec., 1983	15.9	6.8	6.8	6.8	9.1	2.3	0.0	2.3	11.4	13.6	11.4	4.5	9.1	44

Total Sample = 188

articles were read to indicate consistencies of coverage and specific issues across many papers, or the obvious lack of coverage regarding issues, events, and people involved with the development of the Master Teacher Program.

Analysis

The examination of newspaper items pertaining to the Master Teacher Plan (Career Teacher Program) revealed a number of patterns indicative of the handling of and reaction to this educational reform proposal. Several general patterns are noted below, followed by an analysis of specific themes in the newspaper coverage.

The extent to which residents of various cities across the state were kept apprised of developments related to the Master Teacher Plan varied considerably, as might be expected. However, this variation was not directly related to the size of the city being served. Memphis, the state's largest city, has one major paper which had one of the higher rates of coverage (20/188) and one smaller paper which had just three articles in the sample. However, two medium cities - Kingsport and Johnson City, both in East Tennessee, exceeded the total coverage provided by the large Memphis newspaper.

Nashville, Knoxville, and Chattanooga each have two daily papers, one of which provided a somewhat lower rate of coverage (Chattanooga: 19, 14; Knoxville: 15, 11; Nashville: 15, 11). However, one of the Nashville papers was found to have a higher rate of indepth coverage, equivalent to that of the major Memphis newspaper. Each of this paper's articles had a by-line identifying the staff writer involved. The only two newspapers that came close to this rate of writer-designation were the Chattanooga Times (13 of 14) and the Kingsport Times (19 of 24). Identification with the article may be associated with a greater degree of analysis than might be reflected in an undesignated wire-service item.

The distribution of program coverage across 1983 reflected the high interest level generated for this topic. Coverage in each quarter of 1983 for the sample group was comparable in frequency (42, 46, 56, and 44) respectively), with a peak in the third quarter (July through September). This reflected in part the renewed interest that followed the assumption of office by a new TEA president (Marjorie Pike) who expressed a greater willingness to negotiate or compromise on the bill being prepared by the Legislature's Select Committee on Education.

The focus of the newspaper coverage was analyzed by categorizing each article as to the themes or topics addressed. These were classified according to whether they covered: The Master Teacher bill (e.g. features, implementation); the process of development or passage of the program; reactions to the program; financing of the plan; public relations activities; the evaluation system built into the plan.

The largest group of newspaper accounts (104 of 188) dealt with the proposed program itself, either before or after preparation of the final draft of the bill. Only one paper in each of the six major or medium cities (plus the combined Tennessee Press association category) was represented in the sample by nine or more (to a high of 12) articles concerning the bill itself.

In contrast to the relatively extensive coverage (104 of 188) of the proposed program, only eight articles addressed the process of development or shaping of the plan through the year. The one other area which was found to have such sparse coverage was the evaluation component of the program, represented by 12 of 188 articles. This category was established in expectation of considerable attention to the development of the evaluation criteria to determine teacher performance levels, the nature of the

evaluation process, and other aspects of teacher evaluation. While this topic reflected a major concern of teachers and an important feature of the governor's approach to "incentive pay", it was given surprisingly little attention by the newspapers, even within articles describing other facets of the bill.

Financing and public relations were two topics that received at least twice as much coverage as the previous areas by frequency in the sample. The Tennessee Press Association (five items) and the Chattanooga News Free Press (four items) had the greatest number of articles on this subject, with slightly less attention in most of the other papers and one item each in the two Knoxville papers, one Memphis paper, and one small city paper. The public relations effort mounted by the governor and his supporters was also a subject of some newspaper coverage, with 28 of 188 articles dealing with this topic. For example: the Tennesseans for Better Schools organization, a large lobbying/fund raising group put together to generate support for Alexander's program, was described in a number of papers.

As the final topic or theme included in this analysis, articles pertaining to reactions to the Master Teacher Program were categorized. This subject

was addressed in 58 of the 188 newspaper items sampled. Papers represented by 6 to 8 articles on this topic (none had higher frequencies) were one each in Chattanooga, Kingsport, Jackson, Memphis, and the Tennessee Press Association cluster. Knoxville and Nashville papers were represented by as few as four items dealing with reactions of various constituencies.

In an additional phase of the analysis, groups or individuals playing a major role in the program were tallied as they appeared in the sample of articles selected for analysis. The two major parties in the conflict over this program were Governor Alexander and the Tennessee Education Association (TEA). Each claimed the largest share of coverage of any other factor within the "Groups" category, except the general "Other Organizations" cluster. Fifty-nine articles dealt with TEA and its positions, while 58 covered the governor and his stance. It is clear from the equivalence of these two figures how the newspapers saw the nature of the "battle", particularly when the content of the "Other Organizations" area is considered. Most of those articles dealt with the National Education Association (NEA) or the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), typically described as the two leading teachers' unions

in this country (although the NEA objects to this term).

The only other factor represented by ten or more items was the Legislature, which totaled 43 of the 188 articles sampled. The State Department of Education (3), the Interim Commission (8), and the Joint House-Senate Select Committee (9) were three groups intensively involved with the development of the implementation plans, evaluative criteria, and final version of the bill, respectively. Despite their higher degree of responsibility and importance, coverage of these three groups appears to have been less than adequate.

In addition to portraying the topics or issues and groups covered in newspaper accounts of the Master Teacher Program in Tennessee, the sample of 188 articles was analyzed to determine the overall editorial stance taken, if any. For example: as a first step in examining the extent to which a position or stance might be evident, each title was classified as appropriate to the content in the article, or inappropriate; exaggerating or highlighting a minor point. Appropriate titles were typical, as judged to be the case in 141 of the 188 cases. However, a substantial number of articles were perhaps

unintentionally likely to mislead the casual reader. The percentages by newspaper of inappropriate titles were generally about one-third or less. In four cases, about half of the sampled articles coming from those publications were judged as being inappropriate. These newspapers included the major papers in Knoxville, Nashville, and Memphis -- the three largest cities in the state. Thus, the possibility of public misconception being fostered by the coverage in these widely circulated newspapers must be considered.

The content of each article included in this analysis was studied to identify indications of the position being taken regarding the governor's program. Each item was categorized as "pro", "con", or "neutral". It was found that 82 of 188 were "pro", 48 were "con", and 58 were "neutral". This is consistent with an analysis by TEA in late April, 1983 which found most of the state's papers supportive of the Alexander program in their editorial positions. Of seven papers highlighted by TEA as examples of this positive stance ("Most Favor Governor," 1983), the present analysis reached the same conclusion in five cases. The other two involved a small newspaper in Bristol and a major paper in Memphis. According to the current analysis of thirteen newspapers (including one combined category),

9 were found to have more articles favoring than questioning or opposing the program.

Some of these (e.g. Knoxville's two papers, Kingsport's paper, Johnson City's paper, and the smaller Nashville paper) were quite predominantly positive toward the Master Teacher Plan. None were overwhelmingly negative in tone. Only one case, the major Nashville paper, had substantially more articles that were neutral than either positive or negative. Based on this sample, then, it can be concluded that Governor Alexander's program was presented in a favorable light to most newspaper readers in Tennessee. The appeal of an "educational reform/teacher quality" message had evidently been great enough to convince a majority of the education writers and editors in the state that the Master Teacher Program deserved public support.

CHAPTER VIII

THE END OF 1983: PROPOSAL STATUS AND ISSUES

Several major issues emerged during 1983 regarding the governor's proposed plan for educational improvement in Tennessee. Key issues pertained to: involvement of various persons in the program's design; role of the teachers' association in the program; the nature of the teacher reward; and the financing, control and use of money for program funding.

Throughout the remainder of Chapter VIII, these major issues are described and analyzed in terms of their relationship to the conceptualization and development of Tennessee's Master Teacher Program.

Lack of Involvement

The governor first introduced the Master Teacher Program in his speech on January 28, 1983. The groups which would be most affected had little if any advance knowledge about the proposed program. One question that can be raised concerns his motive in excluding the groups (i.e. teachers, administrators, TEA) who would be most affected by the development of this statewide program. It is possible that Alexander had no deliberate reason for excluding teachers, TEA, administrators and other concerned groups. Some have

assumed that he wanted to claim total credit for this dramatic undertaking. One legislator commented that the governor may have had visions of seeing himself as the glorious inventor of a successful program that would achieve national recognition (D. L. Carlson, personal communication, March 26, 1983). However, according to one of the governor's aides, the lack of involvement by the public and educators, coupled with the unsuccessful attempt to convince legislators that adequate support existed for the program, contributed significantly to its failure in the legislature (D. L. Carlson, personal communication, January 5, 1983). Perhaps if the association had seen more teachers included in the effort, the program would have had a better chance to succeed the first time. TEA agreed with several major concepts in the governor's plan, which provided teachers with incentive pay and taxes to finance it. However, they did not agree on how it was to be done and who would make the evaluations. TEA in effect supported the governor in his efforts to do something about the status of education, but it did not support how he was going to achieve the end product.

Supporters of the Alexander Administration drafted a bill that supposedly addressed concerns TEA had voiced about the governor's program. They called it the

Compromise Bill. This issue of involving appropriate groups in the decision making process surfaced a second time when the Compromise Bill was drafted. Planning of the bill did not involve the teachers' association. It may have been that the Alexander Administration drafted the Compromise Bill the way they did for expediency. With only one month remaining before the legislature would adjourn, it became increasingly important to draft some form of incentive pay program that would be acceptable to TEA.

Representative Cobb said, even after the Compromise Bill was presented to TEA, that sponsors of the bill were willing to bend further for the association's approval, with two exceptions: (1) five-year certification would not be changed; and (2) merit pay must be a part of the program (Cobb offers 'compromise', April 1, 1983).

TEA's Position

TEA was placed in a position of conflict when the governor announced his educational plan without consulting the organization. The organization could not refute the governor's intentions. However, fundamental differences existed on what improvements should be made and how they should be implemented. The association

pledged its support in helping to obtain funds to adequately provide for the improvements. This support did not encompass many provisions in the Master Teacher Program, including incentive pay.

The conflict between the teachers' association and the Alexander Administration may not have stemmed as much from their difference in views of the program's content as it did from the threat the program may have posed to TEA. When the governor stipulated that the state would offer a liability insurance plan different from TEA's, at no cost to teachers, the association was obviously worried that its position to offer negotiation-related services for its clientele was being usurped. Many people expressed a concern that if evaluation for certificate renewals and licenses were made a function of the state, local chapters of the teachers' association would have little purpose. According to TEA with the Master Teacher Plan, tenure would no longer exist. Therefore, teachers' security would be threatened. The association established a stance which demonstrated to teachers that their union was behind them and willing to work at altering the governor's program so that it would benefit, not hurt, the state's 46,000 teachers. By taking this stance, TEA found itself fighting a battle with the Alexander

Administration. TEA seemed to have a strong advantage with 38,500 teachers as members. The Master Teacher Program did not appear to have much chance of succeeding without their support. As long as the teachers' association could demonstrate to its membership that it was fighting for them and that the governor's program would eventually cause them problems, TEA was in a good position to stall the program. In contrast, Alexander needed immediate support for his program if it was to be enacted in 1983. TEA achieved its goal and action was deferred for a year on the proposed plan. The plan's deferral was a setback for Alexander. He had invested much of his time and effort in the plan and as a result of the deferral, risked the chance of not being first in the nation to launch such a program.

Incentive Pay

Alexander's Master Teacher Program was based on the incentive pay principle. Under the proposed program, incentive pay would only be available to one-third of the state's teachers. Considering the history of failure experienced by many incentive pay programs in educational systems across the country, there was clearly a basis for the apprehension which

surrounded the notion of a similar program being implemented in Tennessee.

As negotiations progressed between TEA and Alexander, the concept of incentive pay in the program began to take on a different shape. Alexander's reasoning behind the quota was that not all teachers deserved incentive pay, therefore a quota should be set and only the best would receive the reward. Determination of "the best" represented a weak spot in this line of reasoning. His original proposal included no explicit means for evaluating the best teachers and lacked a clear rationale for implying that only one-third of the teachers deserved rewards for excellent teaching.

TEA countered Alexander's plan with the argument that all teachers deserved the opportunity to apply for the reward and that by establishing a fair evaluation system with high standards, the best would be rewarded.

Another party to be considered in the debate about incentive pay is the public. Already disgruntled over poor pupil performance and teaching standards in the schools, many Tennessee citizens could not see incentive pay as a justifiable expenditure of tax money. If incentive pay was to be supported through the taxpayers' money, they wanted to see results.

The issue which evolved was how to reward teachers on an equitable and fair basis, and what teachers would have to do to earn this reward. Alexander's program shifted from a quota system which paid teachers extra money for the same job to a system where all teachers could apply and be eligible. Under the new system teachers would also be expected to assume extra responsibilities.

Alexander intended the pay supplements to bring teachers' base salaries in the state to a level that would compare well with pay scales in other states. He recognized that a competitive base teaching salary was an important factor in attracting promising young career people to education. Research indicates, however, that teachers do not regard salary as the prime factor in attracting and retaining teachers in the profession. Based on past history, an incentive pay program alone is not likely to achieve this goal (Hall, 1980). The fact that teachers do not rank money as their highest priority in determining whether they choose to stay in the teaching profession is another indicator that extra pay alone cannot by itself bring about educational reform. A "master teacher" is one who probably would need other types of incentives, above and beyond an adequate base salary, to thrive in the

teaching profession. These incentives would be intrinsic ones by which teachers would gain a sense of satisfaction. They could occur through involvement in the teaching process and in professional activities designed to foster growth and development (Lawler, 1966; Herzberg, 1959; Openshaw, 1980).

Incentive pay alone probably does not address the goals Governor Alexander claims his program is designed to address -- attracting young, capable people and offering them career positions in an attractive profession. These important goals seem to require more than the incentive of supplementary pay.

The Finance Issue

Financing the Master Teacher Program was a hotly debated issue in the legislature and an issue of concern for Tennessee taxpayers.

Alexander stated that, eventually, an increase in the income tax would be the best means of providing long term funding for this program. He made it very clear, however, (as reported by the media) that he was not going to be the person to impose such a burden on the state, at least not while he was in office. A state income tax could bring political problems to the person endorsing it. It would be an unwanted burden on the

people of Tennessee presented too soon after proposing a controversial educational reform package.

The governor's alternative to an income tax was a one cent increase in the sales tax. This appeared to him to be the most feasible funding strategy at the time, but questions raised in the legislature about the tax applying to amusements and other specific areas. With an amusement tax already in effect, for example, it was argued that a second tax would hurt ticket sales and reduce the probability that top entertainers would choose Tennessee as an entertainment site.

Legislators debated but could not agree on whether to tax food and exclude taxing of amusements. Extensive debate on how to raise the taxes needed to support Alexander's program did not surface until the 1984 legislative session.

State or Local Jurisdiction

In addition to the issue of what revenue would be used to finance the program, there was also an issue about whose responsibility it would be to appropriate the money for various parts of the program (local as opposed to state jurisdiction concerning supplements, bonus).

Under the plan, Tennessee's educational system would no longer retain a single state salary supplement schedule with teachers working a ten-month year. There would be a differentiated salary schedule based on merit and contracts would vary with some teachers working 10 months, 11 months, or 12 months. One problem might be determining who is responsible for providing a teacher with 12 months of work when a superintendent decides not to keep the local school system open in the summer.

The state is presently responsible for teachers' salaries with supplements given at the discretion of local school boards. Local districts have the authority to hire and fire. Under the new program, the state would have the power to override a local judgement on promotion of teachers up the career ladder. If the state overrode a local decision and the district decided to keep a teacher the State Certification Board deemed not satisfactory for promotion, the local district would then be responsible for that teacher's salary. Financing of the plan and management of the program were to be scrutinized in the 1984 legislative session.

Preparing for 1984

Governor Alexander's Master Teacher program was a central focus of discussion and debate throughout Tennessee during 1983. It promised to remain so as 1984 approached. There were basically two issues concerning the proposed Career Ladder Program to be considered in the upcoming legislative session: (1) what kind of educational reform was wanted; and (2) what was the best way to fund it.

Dealing with possibly the most controversial educational issue in the state's history, Governor Alexander responded with a call for a special legislative session to convene January 10, 1984. The governor would have the prerogative in this "extraordinary session" to specify what legislation would be discussed. Alexander specified that the Career Ladder Program, TEA's alternative plan and financing for the education reforms were to take precedence. His outlook on the session revealed a positive attitude towards passage of an incentive pay program for teachers and not much emphasis on a major tax reform. The governor surprised both legislators and the public by announcing the special session, which would be the first of its kind in 17 years.

As 1983 ended, there was little doubt that Alexander's move would force the legislature to make a

decision concerning education reform without further delay.

Bibliography

- Alexander, L. (1983). The governor's 1983 inaugural address. (Available from Archives and Manuscript Section of the state. Library and Archives Building, Nashville).
- Better schools hotline most frequently asked questions. (1983, October). Public document authorization No. 2018. Non-retrievable data.
- Better school program. (1983, January). Tennessee's better schools program: A summary of Governor Lamar Alexander's state of education address. (Presented to the Tennessee Press Association January 28, 1983).
- Bryant, G. (1983, April 29). Is Master Teacher really TEA 'buster'? TEA News. p.5.
- Cobb offers Master Teacher 'compromise'. (1983, April 1). TEA News. p.7.
- Constitution and by-laws of the Tennessee Teachers' Study Council. (1983). (Available from the Better Schools Office. State Department of Education. Nashville).
- Hall, D. Relationships of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. (1978). Journal of Applied Psychology, 34(4), 305-312.
- Herzberg, F. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: Wiley.
- Knoxville Journal. (1983, February 4).
- Lawler, E.E. (1966). Ability as a moderator of the relationship between job attitudes and job performance. Personal Psychology, 19, 153-164.
- Most newspapers favor governor. (1983, April 29). TEA News. p.7
- Nashville Banner. (1983, February 2). p.A-1.
- Nashville Banner. (1983, February 4). p.A-1.
- Nashville Banner. (1983, July 8).

Openshaw, H. (1980). Job satisfaction determinants among faculty and administrators: An application of Hertzberg's motivation-hygiene model in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University.

Report of the Select Committee on Education. (1984, January). A study conducted by direction of senate joint resolution no. 96 of the ninety-third General Assembly. General Assembly of Tennessee Select Committee on Education. (Minority Report). p.85.

Roseholtz, S. & Smylie, M. (1983, December). Teacher compensation and career ladders: Policy of implications from research. (Reported in Report of the Select Committee on Education. January 1984). General Assembly of Tennessee Select Committee on Education.

Select Committee defers salary, class size until Nov.22. (1983, November 15). TEA News. p.1.

Select Committee on Education. (1983, March). Tennessee Teacher Excellence Proposal. Introduced March 3, 1983. (Available from Archives and Manuscript section of the state. Library and Archives Building. Nashville).

Select Committee on Education. (1983, March). Compromise bill deferred for study March 17, 1983. (Available from Archives and Manuscript section of the state. Library and Archives Building. Nashville).

Teacher evaluation: to be or not to be. (1983, May 16). TEA News. p.2.

Tennessee comprehensive education study. (1982, December). A task force review of education. (Available from Archives and Manuscript section of the state. Library and Archives Building. Nashville).

Tennessee teacher excellence program. (1983, March). (Available from Archives and Manuscript section of the state. Library and Archives Building. Nashville).

The budget message. (1983, March). The budget message by governor Lamar Alexander presented March 1, 1983. (Available from Archives and Manuscript section of the state. Library and Archives Building. Nashville).

The Tennessean. (1983, January 30). p.A-1.

The Tennessean. (1983, February 10). p.B-1.

The Tennessean. (1983, March 17). p. 10-a.

The Tennessean. (1983, March 29). p.B-1.

Vetoes 'pure revenge': Cheshier. (1983, June 15). TEA
News. p.1.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 96 STUDY COMMITTEE

Appendix A

(Select Committee on Education)

Senate Joint Resolution 96 Study Committee

The Select Committee on Education was established out of a need to study the various proposals for teacher compensation and other related educational issues (i.e. college preparation and in-service training for teachers). The organizational meeting, July, 1983, was held for the purpose of electing the chairman (Steve Bivens) and organizing the committee into three subcommittees (Teacher Compensation, Instructional Development, and Teacher Training). Seven senators and seven representatives comprised the group, each member serving on two committees.

During the period of time the Select Committee on Education carried out its study, thirty-four witnesses gave testimony. These testimonies represented the base from which recommendations were adopted in each subcommittee. Following this action in the subcommittees, the recommendations were voted on in full committee and proposed for legislation to the General Assembly.

Although the Select Committee on Education did not directly propose recommendations for teacher

evaluation, it worked closely with the Interim Commission as the 18 member group assumed the responsibility of developing the evaluation process for review during the legislative session. The Select Committee met 14 times during the course of study.

Reference Guide

Members of SJR 96 Study Committee:

Senator Tommy Burks
Senator Joe Crockett
Senator Leonard Dunavant
Senator James E. Elkins
Senator Frank Lashlee
Senator Anna Belle O'Brien
Senator John Rucker
Representative Walter Work
Representative Steve Cobb
Representative Steve Kelly
Representative Steve Bivens
Representative Paul Starnes
Representative Zane Whitson

The following is a list of those persons who testified
before the Select Committee on Education.

Dr. Jay Robinson, Superintendent,
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Charlotte, NC

Dr. Phillip Schlechty, Professor of Education
Lake Placid, NY

Ms. Linda Bond, Senate Education Committee

California General Assembly

Dr. Robert Saunders, Dean, College of Education
Memphis State University

Dr. Richard Wisniewski, Dean, College of Education
University of Tennessee

Dr. James Stamper, Dean of Academic Affairs
Belmont College

Dr. Eva Galambos, Task Force Staff Director
Southern Regional Education Board

Dr. Billy Reagan, Superintendent, Houston
Independent Schools
Houston, Texas

Dr. Susan Rosenholtz, Vanderbilt University

Dr. Robert McElrath, Commissioner, Department of
Education

Dr. Roy Stinnet, Dean, College of Education,
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Dr. Lynton Deck, Director, Learning Technology Center
Vanderbilt University

Ms. Donna Cotner, President-Elect, Tennessee Education
Association

Estel Mills, Superintendent, McNairy County Schools

Lynn Twymann, History, Huntingdon Jr. High School

Jeanette Schlaeger, English, Cleveland High School

Margeret Horsnell, Murrell School, Nashville

Jerry Frazier, Assistant Principal, Bradley County
High School

Selected Materials

1. Minority Report received January, 1984.
2. Improvements to the Master Teacher Program
November 28, 1983.

Received January, 1984 From: Senator Joe Crockett

MINORITY REPORT

The Select Committee on Education was given a difficult task by the General Assembly. The issues examined by the Committee were complex and often emotional. The Committee's recommendations, if approved by the legislature, would have a profound impact on public education in Tennessee. While many of these recommendations are worthy of support, some proposed policy changes could prove disruptive and potentially damaging to the teaching profession. Likewise, it is possible that successful reform in public education might be impeded by needed changes that the Committee declined to recommend.

In considering the proposed legislation adopted by the Committee, the General Assembly should examine carefully the potential impact of policy changes on the relationship between state and local government. Over time the guiding philosophy in Tennessee has been a desire to retain maximum control of education policy in the hands of local school boards. This philosophy has

contributed greatly to the success and public support of education. Any policy change that threatens the perception of local control should be weighed against the consequences of such a change on the vitality of public education.

One aspect of the Committee's recommendations could jeopardize the idea of local control of education. Among the recommendations was a decision to authorize the state to make the final determination as to whether a teacher would be admitted to the Career Ladder after the fourth year of employment. At present the local school board, by virtue of granting or denying tenure, is the sole "gatekeeper" of the teaching profession. By granting this authority to the state, a dual system would be constructed in which the local board would have authority over tenure while the state would have discretion over accessibility to the Career Ladder. The possibility exists for a local board to grant a teacher tenure (by definition, the acknowledgement of adequate teaching skills) while the state would deny the same teacher entry onto the Career Ladder. The inconsistency evident in such a policy could produce antagonism between the state and local school boards, and serve to weaken the credibility of the evaluation process.

Another of the Committee's recommendations would alter the current status of local control by circumventing the present tenure law. By giving the state authority to reevaluate teachers periodically and determine if those teachers are worthy of continued state financial support, the General Assembly would be diluting the concept that members of a local school board are the best judges of who should teach in their schools. The best of intentions are unlikely to prevent anxiety and discord that will follow a transfer of this authority from the debate of local school boards to the impersonal judgement of a state evaluation.

A third portion of the Committee's proposed legislation also could prove to have an unforeseen impact on local administration. In recent years the equity of the teaching profession has been enhanced by the practice of professional negotiations between teachers' organizations and local school boards. Apparent ambiguities in the Committee's recommendations could prove damaging to locally negotiated provisions for posted vacancies, voluntary transfers and seniority considerations. It would be misguided for any legislation to be enacted without proper attention to these concerns.

Two other actions by the Committee deserve mention. In the desire to improve the quality of public education, the Committee may have focused too much of its effort on reforming the role of the teacher, and too little on the classroom conditions that are an equally important factor in student achievement. The recommendation that would provide teachers' aides for grades 1-3 is a step in the right direction. A more meaningful approach, however, would have been a recommendation to lower the pupil-teacher ratio. Fiscal considerations notwithstanding, a phased lowering of the pupil-teacher ratio to 20-1 in grades 1-3 could well prove more beneficial to student learning than the remainder of the Committee's recommendations.

A final observation is required in regard to the Committee's recommended across-the-board salary increase for teachers. As meaningful as a Career Ladder might be in terms of professional development or self-esteem, deferred financial gratification will not serve to attract quality students to the teaching profession. To bring about any significant change in current attrition rates for teachers and students preparing to teach, a salary increase of at least 15 percent is imperative.

As stated, the Select Committee on Education struggled admirably with an extremely difficult task. These comments are submitted with the hope that they will be a constructive contribution to the General Assembly's consideration of the important matter.

11/28/83

123

IMPROVEMENTS
TO THE
MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM

<u>Concern with Original</u>	<u>Ammendments to SB-1000</u>	<u>Further Improvements</u> <u>By Select Committee</u>
1. The term "Master Teacher" was considered unacceptable.		The program is now referred to as the "Career Teacher Program." The top career level will now be referred to as "Distinguished Senior Teacher."
2. Good teachers would have to wait eight or more years to receive the special incentive pay supplements. Many would not want to wait that long and should be recognized sooner.	Every teacher except the beginning Apprentice Teacher will be eligible for a \$1,000 Professional Teacher supplement under the new program. This will be phased in on a seniority basis over a three-year period beginning 1984-85. Like other supplements in the program, this will be in addition to the teacher's regular salary.	Provides most tenured teachers with a means for qualifying for the \$1,000 pay supplement in the first year of the program.
3. The majority of teachers would not receive an incentive pay supplement from the state. Only 35 percent	With the addition of the new supplement for Professional Teachers joining the program, an estimated 87 percent of	Percentage "quotas" have been removed. All who meet the standards can move to the appropriate career level.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| would receive the special state-paid supplements. | all teachers--those with three or more years experience--will be eligible for the special higher pay. | A special joint committee of the General Assembly will be appointed to oversee the fiscal posture of the program. |
| 4. The 10 percent cap on state-paid Master Teachers may be too restrictive, especially for smaller school districts. | The 10 percent limit on state-paid Master Teacher positions has been increased to 15 percent. The 25 percent limit for state-paid Senior Teachers remains the same. Therefore, 40 percent of all teachers in a system could now receive one of the two higher supplements. | Percentage "quotas" have been removed. |
| 5. The requirement that teachers must re-earn their certificates every five years based on classroom performance could circumvent the job security guarantees provided by the state's tenure law. | | This provision has been eliminated, although existing standards for recertification will be raised. Teachers at the top two career levels (Senior Teacher and Distinguished Senior Teacher) would still have to re-earn those supplementary certificates every five years.

Also, there will be a new mechanism for removing an incompetent teacher that will be separate from the career ladder. |

6. Not all outstanding teachers could work year-round or even 11 months. That means they could not be Senior or Master Teachers if they must work 11 or 12 months. This is unfair for teachers with children at home or who must be away from school in the summer months for other reasons.

The supplement formula has been changed so the Master Teacher will now have an option of working on a 10-, 11- or 12-month contract. The Senior Teacher could work either on a 10- or 11- month contract. Of course, the state-paid supplements will vary according to the length of the contract.

The Distinguished Senior Teacher could choose a 10-, 11- or 12-month contract consistent with the workplan developed by the local school system. The Senior Teacher could likewise choose a 10- or 11-month contract.

The corresponding supplements--ranging from 2,000 to 7,000--have been adopted for these top two career levels.

The 10-month Senior Teacher will receive a \$2,000 supplement, the 11-month Senior Teacher \$4,000.

The Master Teacher will receive a \$3,000 supplement on a 10-month contract, \$5,000 on 11 months, and \$7,000 on 12 months.

7. The corresponding cap on the number of state-paid Senior and Master Principals and Supervisors may also be unrealistic.

The 25 percent limit on state-paid Senior Principals and Supervisors has been increased to 35 percent. The 10 percent limit for state-paid Master Principals and Supervisors has been doubled to 20 percent.

The Senior Principal and Senior Supervisor supplement will be \$4,000. The Master Principal and Master Supervisor supplement will be \$7,000.

8. The size of the supplements eventually may need to be increased.

The legislation now provides the General Assembly will review the supplements at least every four years.

Percentage "quotas" have been removed.

This is one of several review mechanisms adopted by the Select Committee.

9. The process by which teachers will be evaluated is too vague. We haven't seen the standards that will be used to judge effective performance in the classroom.

The legislation was extensively revised and expanded to spell out the evaluation criteria and process in greater detail. This change is based on the relevant portion of the bill developed by the TEA. Even further details will be developed by the new Commission, with the approval the State Board of Education.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 10. The appeal or grievance procedure called for in the bill is vague and inadequate, | The section of the bill providing a review process for teachers who are denied a higher level of certification has been extensively expanded with a detailed procedure for appeal and review. For example, the Commission could now extend a certificate for an additional year while a decision is being reviewed. Also, a teacher who received an unfavorable decision would be informed in detail as to the reasons for such a decision. | The more extensive due process procedures have been adopted. |
| 11. A teacher now on the job who decides to enter the new system may want to get out later and return to the old certification system. There should be a provision for that. | The program will now include a so-called "toe-in-the-water" provision. Presently-employed teachers may enter the new system but return to the old system later. Of course, no teacher now teaching need be affected at all by the new Master Teacher Program. For them, it is strictly voluntary. | The more detailed "toe-in-the water" language has been adopted. |
| 12. Master Teachers who are hired by a local school board one year might be unfairly treated if that board chose to employ someone | Once a teacher qualifies for and receives an incentive supplement as a Professional, Senior or Master Teacher, he or she cannot be denied the | This more detailed protection has been adopted. |

else in the same slot the following year.

supplement unless there is cause for dismissal, failure to maintain the certificate, or a personal decision not to perform the extra duties required of the Senior or Master Teacher.

13. Won't the Commissioner of Education have too much discretion in regard to the cap that is placed each year on the number of state-paid Senior and Master Teachers a local system can employ?

The limit on the number of state-paid incentive supplements would be reached in 1986-87.

Percentage "quotas" have been removed. Thereafter, every school system will be guaranteed a state-paid complement of 15 percent Master Teachers and 25 percent Senior Teachers. In addition, the legislation now more clearly relates any interim limitations to the actual revenues that will be produced by the phased-in sales tax increase, which was the original intent.

14. Master Teachers should be out of the classroom as little as possible. The minimum of 65 percent on time to be spent in class was considered to be too low.

Master Teachers could be out of the classroom no more than 10 days out of the school year. Senior Teachers could be out of the classroom no more than five days per school year.

If it proves necessary for the Distinguished Senior Teacher to exceed the 10-day limit, the teacher will be placed on a sabbatical at state expense.

Similar flexibility is provided for principals and supervisors who perform such services for

the State Certification
Commission.

15. The 21-member State Master Teacher Certification was considered too cumbersome. Its large size might actually make it more vulnerable to control by the State Department of Education.
- The size has been cut from 21 members to 13. Appointees will be subject to confirmation by both houses of the General Assembly. They will have more authority to set standards and to certify all teachers under the new program.
16. The composition of the extremely important Interim Commission was too vague.
- The Interim Commission's 18 members will include the "Teacher of the Year"; the three most recent living Teachers of the Year; the president and president-elect of the TEA; the presidents of the Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents, the Tennessee School Boards Association, and the Tennessee Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development; the chairman of the Elementary Principals' Study Council; the past chairman of the Secondary Principals' Association; the president-elect of the Tennessee Congress of Parents and Teachers; a representative of the Deans' Council for Teacher
- The Governor will appoint the 18-member Interim Commission and is urged to appoint the same members who have served during 1983.

Education; the Commissioner of Education, and four distinguished lay persons.

17. No provision was made to review and ultimately increase standards in the colleges of education that train the new teachers.

The State Board of Education, the new Certification Commission, over the next two years will study the adequacy of the teacher training programs--including curriculum, faculty and other factors--and report these findings to the Legislature.

Entry standards for aspiring new teachers will be upgraded. A teachers' college could lose state certification if fewer than 70 percent of its graduates pass the state exam.

18. There was no provision with regard to the shortage of math and science teachers.

A tuition loan program will be established to become math and science teachers.

19. There was no provision with regard to the length of the school year.

The school year will be increased by five days.

20. There was no provision with regard to the problems associated with waivers granted for out-of-field teaching.

By January 1985, the State Board of Education will submit to the General Assembly a recommendation of methods to reduce the number of waivers granted for out-of-field teaching.

21. There was no provision with regard to the problems encountered by teachers with large

The state will provide teacher aides in grades 1-3 by 1986-1987. Each local system would be

class sizes.

131

entitled to one
state-funded teacher's
aide for each three
full-time certified
teachers by the third
year.

145

146

APPENDIX B
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

Appendix B
Governor's Office

A 12 member task force was created in the governor's office, chaired by an aide, Lewis Lavine, to campaign for the Better Schools Program. The task force worked towards informing the public of the program through home mailings and working with the State Department in sending bi-weekly information to all teachers. An organization called "Tennesseans for Better Schools" was created through the efforts of the task force to raise money for support of the various activities and mailings related to promoting the Better Schools Program. This effort resulted in raising \$400,000 of which a large portion was spent on brochures, home mailings, and television coverage for the governor. This private non-profit organization consisted of people who either signed a petition supporting the program and/or contributed money. The 40,000 members made it the largest educational lobby in the state.

The original task force was reduced to three in February, 1983 when the Legislature convened due to the cost in time and money to keep 12 people out of their

regular jobs in the governor's office. The three governor's aides, who remained as the core of the task force, devoted the majority of their time working with the Better Schools Program (i.e. speaking engagements, traveling with governor in and out of state, working with the State Department of Education, promoting public awareness through brochures and other mailings).

In April, 1983, near adjournment of the Legislative Session, the governor appointed an Interim Commission to work as a part of the State Department of Education in studying and developing the Better Schools Program. At this time the office was established in the State Department and many of the responsibilities which had been handled in the governor's office were now assumed by the staff in the Better Schools Office.

Reference Guide

Governor:

Lamar Alexander

Governor's Office
Capitol Building
Nashville, TN 37219

Governor's Aides:

Keel Hunt

Suite G-4
Capitol Building
Nashville, TN 37219

Bracey Campbell

Governor's Office
Special Assistant to
the Governor
Capitol Building
Nashville, TN 37219

Lewis Lavine

State Planning Office
Suite G-4
Capitol Building
Nashville, TN 37219

Selected Materials

1. Governor's speech Jauuary 28, 1983 (Overview)
2. The Budget Message March 1, 1983

BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Tennessee's BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM: A Summary of Governor Lamar Alexander's State of Education Address

Presented to the Tennessee Press Association
January 28, 1984

Better schools will mean better jobs and higher incomes for Tennesseans -- The BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM is the most important proposal I will make in my eight years as Governor.

We need better jobs because our family incomes are too low, 44th in the country.

To get better jobs, we will have to learn Basic Skills, Computer Skills, New Job Skills. The new jobs will be different jobs, relying more on brain power than muscle power.

We have the brains but haven't developed them. Too many eighth-graders don't have eighth-grade skills. Half our adults don't have a high school degree. We have one of the highest high school drop-out rates. Most of us don't know anything about computers and have too little technical education.

We can't get better jobs without better skills. We can't get better skills without better schools.

The BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM is not mine. Almost every point is based upon recommendations from the Legislature's extraordinary new Comprehensive Education Study. This program's ideas come from business, taxpayers, boards of education, educators, parents, students and especially our classroom teachers.

It is our BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM, our best ideas about our most urgent need. Please examine it and support it.

Most of all, tell the Legislature what you think. It is in their hands.

Each of the first nine points is crucial:

1. Basic Skills First - The teacher-designed new elementary curriculum is in 11,366 classrooms. It established 1,300 skills in reading and math, 680 of which must be learned. By 1990, every child (who is not severely handicapped) should pass the Basic Skills First eighth grade competency test before entering ninth grade.

2. Computer Skills Next - Every child will know basic computer skills before ninth grade.

3. Kindergarten for Every Child - Every child must start at the kindergarten level, even if the child does not start school until age six.

4. More High School Math and Science - Double the one credit of math and one credit of science we now require and pay for the extra teachers.

5. Special Residential Summer Schools for Gifted Juniors and Seniors - Reward academic excellence, not just athletic excellence.

6. Redefine High School Vocational Education Curriculum - Tie it more closely to the jobs of the 80's and provide equipment.

7. Classroom Discipline - Create alternative schools for students who disrupt classrooms. State-paid liability insurance for teachers and all other school personnel costs only \$2.50 per teacher. We should support teachers, not sue them in court.

8. Put Adult Job Skill Training under the Board of Regents - Our 50 community colleges, technical institutes and area vocational schools should have a single overall management. Most over 21 will be going back to school on a brush up on basic skills and learn computer and new job skills.

9. Centers of Excellence at Universities - Provide first-rate financing for first-rate programs and better overall support for good teaching and research. In the 1980's, good universities will spin off the ideas that spin off new jobs.

- Music in the early grades - With budgets so tight, I cannot make this a top ten priority. But we will provide a small state base of support and I will

raise money privately to keep Tennessee's musical heritage in Tennessee's schools.

10. The MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM and MASTER PRINCIPAL PROGRAM - This is the most important of all.

Our teachers are good, but not as good as they can be.

Our principals are good school leaders, but not as good as they should be.

Therefore, our schools are good, but not good enough to teach us the skills we need to get better jobs.

Today, Tennessee's teachers are paid about as well, on the average, as other Tennessee workers: about 82% of the national average salary.

But the best teachers get paid no more than the worst. We expect teachers to reward excellence in the classroom, but we don't reward their excellence in the classroom. We don't attract the best young people to teaching. Because they have so little to look forward to financially, we can't keep our best teachers teaching.

The MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM is an incentive pay system that will make teaching a fully professional career, draw our best young people into it, keep our best teachers in it, challenge our best teachers to do even better, and inspire excellence in our classrooms by rewarding excellence in our teachers.

Under this system, 60% or (16,275) of Tennessee's teachers with eight or more years of experience can be Senior or Master Teachers. Master Teachers would be among the best and best paid public school teachers in the country in a statewide system.

The MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM:

-- Protects the pay, tenure, benefits and jobs of every teacher teaching today. Every teacher will be encouraged to join the new system, but it is each teacher's choice. All new teachers will be in the system.

-- Sets up four career stages: Apprentice Teacher, Professional Teacher, Senior Teacher, Master Teacher. Each teacher will have a five-year license for one of the four tiers. An Apprentice Teacher must become a Professional Teacher within five years or seek a new career. Professional, Senior and Master Teachers must all renew their license (or more up to a higher License) every five years.

A teacher will obtain or renew a license from the State Board of Education, not the local school district. (The teacher's contract still is with a local school system.) The State Board will base its judgements upon the recommendations of a new Master Certification Commission composed of Master Teachers, other educators and lay people after individual peer observation in the classroom and examination of student achievement scores.

There is a new pay system:

-- Apprentice and Professional Teachers will be paid exactly as teachers are paid today.

-- The state will pay each Senior Teacher (who must have at least eight years teaching experience) 30% more than the state will pay a Professional Teacher.

Example: Sam Teacher today works 10 months for Average City School System. Sam has taught for 10 years. He has a Master's Degree. The state pays Sam \$13,810. Average city adds \$2,859. Sam's annual salary: \$16,669.

As a Senior Teacher Sam will work 11 months. The state will increase its pay to Sam by 30%, giving Sam a \$4,143 pay raise. Sam's new annual salary: \$20,812.

Sam could make more if he can get a contract with another school system that pays a higher "local slupplement" than Average City. Sam's salary as a senior Teacher this year in Shelby County would be \$23,333; in Dyersburg, \$23,693, in Metro Nashville \$24,184; in Dickson, \$22,521; in Cumberland County \$20,371; in Knox County, \$21,992; in Greeneville, \$23,118.

The State will pay 100 percent of the extra cost for about 11,500 Senior Teachers. That is 25% of all

Tennessee's teachers and 50% of all with eight or more years experience.

An average Tennessee Senior Teacher's salary will be \$2,275 higher than the 1982 Southeastern average teacher's salary. It will be nearly as much as the national average teacher's salary.

-- The State will pay each Master Teacher 60% more than the State will pay a Professional Teacher. A Master Teacher must have at least 13 years of experience and accept significant added responsibilities, including evaluation of other teachers' performance.

Example: Sue Teacher today works 10 months for Average City School System. Sue has taught for 15 years. She has a Master's Degree. The State pays Sue \$14,715. Average City adds \$3,329. Sue's annual salary: \$18,044.

As a Master Teacher, Sue will work 12 months. The State will increase its pay to Sue by 60%, giving Sue a \$8,829 pay raise. Sue's new annual salary: \$26,873.

If she teaches as a Master Teacher in Memphis, Sue could make \$28,479; in Jackson, \$29,695; in Sumner County, \$27,507; in Chattanooga, \$30,833; in Oak Ridge, \$33,576; in Kingsport, \$32,219.

The State will pay 100% of the extra cost for about 4,650 Master Teachers. This is 10% of all Tennessee's teachers and on in four of all with 11 or more years of experience.

A similar incentive pay system will be established in a corresponding MASTER PRINCIPAL PROGRAM for school leaders.

Tennessee will be first in the country in terms of making public school teaching a truly professional career which both demands and rewards excellence.

The BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM, from Basic Skills and Computer Skills to New Job Skills, from University Centers of Excellence to Master Teachers and Principals will cost a lot.

It should be phased in as the economy improves state revenues. But to pay for it when it is fully

operational in 1986-87, we will need about \$210 million more than our present revenue structure will produce.

To pay for it, we will need the only general tax increase I have proposed since I've been Governor.

By way of example or as a measure of what we can afford, a 5/8 cent increase in the sales tax would raise about \$210 million in 1986-87. I will present my specific budget and revenue recommendations to the Legislature on March 1 when I have finished my review of all the State's needs for the next few years. But I do not propose to fund the BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM with a general income tax.

Even with a \$210 million tax increase, we will still have the lowest personal taxes of any state in the South and about the lowest in the country.

I will oppose, campaign against and veto any general tax increase that does not include the BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM. That will be my position until the BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM is law.

I am convinced that no Tennessee taxpayer wants to pay more for more of the same. I am equally convinced most Tennesseans are ready to support real changes in our schools and pay more for those changes if that is necessary.

I am an eighth-generation Tennessean, and I am tired of seeing us so often at the back of the line when we are smart enough and -- if we spend it wisely -- have money enough to be at the front of the line.

The BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM can give us a breakthrough in the classroom -- and better schools mean better skills, better jobs and higher family incomes for every Tennessee family.

That is my goal -- and the goal of the BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM and the MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM.

If it is your goal, there is one thing for you to do: contact your Legislator at his or her home or at the State Capitol, Nashville. If you don't know your Legislator's number in Nashville, call 615-741-2065.

If you want more information call our toll free BETTER SCHOOLS HOTLINE: 1-800-342-5005.

THE BUDGET MESSAGE

BY GOVERNOR LAMAR ALEXANDER
March 1, 1983

Lt. Governor Wilder, Speaker McWherter, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen of the 93rd General Assembly, Members of the Cabinet, Fellow Tennesseans:

Chet Atkins said: "In this life you have to be careful where you aim, because you usually end up right where you aim."

We spend too little time aiming, especially in government.

Take, for example, this speech tonight.

I'm supposed to talk about how we pay for what the state government will do between July 1 of this year and July 1, 1984.

We almost always start at the wrong end of that kind of discussion.

The Government's good at raising taxes to pay for more of the same kind of government we already have.

But we're not so good at figuring out, first, where we should aim and what we must do to get there.

I don't think you'll be suprised at my example of this.

Take teachers' salaries.

Every year we come up with a modest average pay raise for the state's share of the salaries for 46,000 public school teachers.

Except for a little extra pay for years of experience and number of degrees, every teacher gets the same increase. Five percent, six percent or seven percent for the best. Five percent, six percent or seven percent for the worst.

Local governments then add a little to their share of the teacher's salary -- across-the-board. It is usually a lower percentage than what the state gives.

The budget is declared balanced and everyone goes off reasonably proud of himself . . . everyone, that is, . . . except the teacher who gets a paycheck that offers a career teacher virtually nothing to look forward to financially;

. . . except the parents, who are increasingly disturbed by the results achieved in schools filled by teachers who have no real financial incentive;

. . . except the taxpayer, who wonders what sense it makes to keep pouring tens of millions of new dollars across the board into school systems that are not as good as they could be or must be.

Where are we aiming with a teacher pay policy that has in it not one penny of reward for doing a good job?

I can give you some more specific examples on that.

I believe you will be at least surprised.

Look at what a teacher has to look forward to in Fayette County, Governor Wilder's home school district:

A brand new seventh grade teacher, fresh out of college, makes \$12,200.

In the next classroom, a teacher for 30 years, who may be regarded by everyone in Fayette County as the best seventh grade teacher for miles around, a person who may have had a profound effect on the lives of hundreds of young people for two generations, makes less than \$15,000.

In other words our policy says: be the best seventh grade teacher, and you may be paid less than \$3,000 more after 30 years than the newest teacher in the school.

Let's not pick on the people you live with, Governor Wilder.

That's only a little below average for Tennessee.

Take Senator Garland's home, Greeneville, and Greene County:

In Greene County, the salary figures are almost exactly the same as in Fayette County.

Even in Greeneville, where Education Commissioner McElrath was Superintendent, and where taxpayers make one of Tennessee's best efforts to pay teachers more, the difference is between \$14,000 and \$20,000.

Three to six thousand dollars of career opportunity. That's what we give teachers to look forward to.

How about Weakly County, Speaker McWherter's hometown.

The new teacher makes \$12,600, the 30 year expert less than \$16,000.

Jim Henry, the Republican leader in the House, is from Kingston. There you can start at \$12,500. Someone doing that same job better than anyone else in the system makes \$4,000 more.

Senator O'Brien and Walter Work are chairmen of the Education Committees.

In Cumberland County, Senator O'Brien's home, the range of opportunity is from \$13,000 to \$16,000.

In Dickson where Mr. Work lives, the pay range from the newest to the best is \$12,300 to \$16,500.

It is misleading, of course, always to suggest that the 30-year teacher may be the best in the school. There may be two 30-year teachers side-by-side, one pretty good, one not so good, and they would make exactly the same.

Or worse, there is nothing in our system to prevent the worst teacher from making more than the best.

You can make a little more if you get a master's degree or take an administrative job.

But not one Tennessee public school teacher is paid a penny based upon whether he or she is doing a good job teaching!

It is pretty clear to me where we are aiming with that kind of system of financial rewards for people doing one of the most important jobs in our state.

The best we can say for our system today is that it aims to attract teachers who by sheer dedication alone are willing to tolerate staying in a career that offers \$3,000 or \$4,000 of financial reward over a lifetime of service. That is our aim today, and it is crazy.

Remember, in this life you usually get where you aim.

Where has this aim gotten us in public education in Tennessee?

We have some excellent schools, thousands of dedicated teachers and tens of thousands of parents busy every day trying to improve schools.

But let's be honest about where we have gotten:

First, many of our best teachers are taking better paying jobs. The turnover rate is at a record high. Forty-two percent of the teachers have taught seven years or less.

Second, we are not attracting many of the best students to teaching. The Dean of the University of Tennessee College of Education told me the other day that his entering students' test scores rank 11th out of the 12 colleges at UT-Knoxville. Other Deans of Education tell the same story.

Third, all of that has something to do with the fact that half of Tennessee's adults don't have a high school education, that our high school dropout rate is one of the highest in the country, that achievement scores in the middle grades and high school are below national averages, and that one of eight of our high school seniors this year is flunking a proficiency test that they get five chances to pass and that is geared only to sixth and seventh grade levels.

We have been aiming low.

Where have we gotten?

We have gotten where we aimed.

We may be tired of being at the back of the line in good-paying jobs and educational levels, but unless we make some big changes we had better get ready for a long wait. Because aimed the way we are today, we will be permanently stuck while the rest of the country races by us.

We can do something about it.

We can change our aim.

This four-year budget plan for the BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM, especially the Master Teacher and Master Principal concept, will do it.

And let me say something very important about Better Schools and Master Teachers right here.

I hear a good deal about this being the Governor's program. It is not. I am for it, as strong as I've been for anything in my life. But it is not my program.

I am preaching to the choir.

Almost all of it came from this book right here: The Tennessee Comprehensive Education Study. It is the first survey in 26 years of public education. It is the most important in our history.

This is the Legislature's own study. It took a year of hard work. And I would like to recognize those members of this General Assembly who were part of it.

Senator Crockett, Elkins, Lashlee, O'Brien, Person and Williams.

Representatives King, Robinson, Whitson and Work.

The Better Schools proposals -- from basic skills and computer skills to new job skills -- are all there.

Let me read for you what your own study says about where we are aiming with teacher pay.

On page 254: "The State Board of Education should consider requiring an apprenticeship program for beginning teachers prior to professional certification. During such a period, the apprentice-teacher would be closely supervised and evaluated by a 'master teacher'."

The Master Teacher Program does that.

And, on page 256: "The state should set as a long-range goal raising the level of the average teacher's salary in Tennessee to the average teacher's salary of the states bordering Tennessee."

The Master Teacher and Master Principal programs would do that.

And on page 257: "The State Board of Education should investigate ways of rewarding outstanding teachers (as determined by fair and impartial evaluation) over and beyond their set salaries."

The Master Teacher Program does just that.

And, on pages 396 and 397: The report urges establishing the rank of Master Teacher and says: "Additional salary monies should be provided for outstanding teachers at all levels to make the profession more competitive in the market place," especially for those who earn the rank of Master Teacher.

The Master Teacher Program does exactly what your report said we must do.

Well, I have tried to be not just a careful student of what I know the public wants, what I know is the right thing to do, but of precisely what this Legislature's task force recommended. Therefore, I have made the Better Schools and Master Teacher Program the most important and most expensive part of the budget for the next four years. It is the most important proposal I will ever make and you will ever consider.

I am aiming toward excellence in education because better schools mean better jobs.

The Master Teacher Program is based on a familiar notion: you pay somebody more for doing and especially good job and accepting more of the most difficult work.

A Senior Teacher will have an eleven month contract and earn a \$4,350 pay increase.

A Master Teacher will have a twelve month contract and earn an \$8,925 pay increase.

In the program's first four years, the state would pay these higher salaries to 15,225 teachers, or 60% of those who have taught eight or more years.

All teachers in the program must renew their teaching licenses every five years based upon an evaluation by other Master Teachers and Principals.

No one teaching today would ever have to join the program.

Our public schools will be among the best in the country because many of our teachers will be among the best and the best paid public school teachers in the country. Some people are against the Master Teacher idea.

Let me list their reasons:

1. Some people say you shouldn't pay the best teachers more money than other teachers.

That reminds me of a breakfast conversation I had last week. One Legislator, when told that a Master Teacher could make \$26,000 a year in his hometown, said that that was more than a bank vice-president makes.

Well, of course it is. Some teachers are worth more the the community than a bank vice-president. But not every teacher is. And, noot every bank employee is paid as well as a vice-president.

2. Some people say teachers shouldn't be evaluated every five years.

But why not? It should be a fair and impartial evaluation by teachers from outside the evaluated teacher's district to get rid of local political influences. It should be done whether or not there is an incentive pay system. But evaluations without incentive pay won't solve the problem: you have to give good teachers something to look forward to to attract them and keep them, inspire them and keep them looking ahead to a teaching career in Tennessee.

3. Some teachers are opposed to it.

That is true. Some are. It is a big change for the profession. There are questions.

But I have found that when I have a chance to let teachers know exactly what is being proposed, that the details can be worked out, that it will be phased in slowly and that it is entirely optional for anyone teaching today, they like it. I got a letter just last week from the teachers at Kingston Elementary School where I visited: 79% of the faculty favors Master Teacher.

4. No one else does it.

That is true. Amazingly enough, no state pays its public school teachers more money for doing a good job.

It would be an historic change. Tennessee would lead in the nation. We would have the most professional teaching and school leadership careers in America. Our teachers would be among the best and the best paid. We would be first instead of tagging along behind.

What's so wrong with that?

In the last four budgets, we waded through some pretty terrible economic times.

While family budgets were tight, we tried to show some compassion for the taxpayer.

We reduced the size of government by 4,000 employees.

We reduced the State debt by \$100 million.

We kept an AAA rating -- one of only 12 states to do so.

We avoided a general tax increase.

Such tightfisted management and legislating bothers some people.

But I like it.

I still believe that the biggest challenge facing government employees is spending what we've got well instead of figuring out how to spend more.

Our tightfistedness has saved some money.

By reducing the debt, we have \$15 million more each year to spend that would have gone to debt service.

By reducing employees instead of adding them at the rate of the 1970's, we have avoided having to spend another 225 million each year.

By any measurement, our state personal taxes are about the lowest in the country.

These next four years, it is time to spend some new money on quality improvements for better schools, higher paying jobs, a clean state, healthy children, efficient prisons.

If we can make some real, fundamental changes in these areas, I am willing to pay and willing to ask others to pay so we can have enough money to get where we're aiming.

For example, the four-year budget plan has up to \$5 million a year new money for adult job skills training.

But if we are merely going to keep the same split management responsibility for the 40 schools that teach those jobs skills, I would recommend to the taxpayers that they keep their money in their pockets.

There is \$20 million in the budget for another of your task force suggestions: University Centers of Excellence.

If, on the other hand, everybody insists on having every campus offer every program, then the taxpayers should keep their money.

By the fourth year, this budget plan has \$116 million for Senior and Master Teacher and Administrator salaries and for five-year evaluations of every teachers.

But if, on the other hand, our aim is only to continue merely handing out average raises regardless of performance, the taxpayers can find better things to do with their money.

There are three sets of documents in front of you.

Take the small one first.

It is like the one-page budget summaries I have used the last couple of years to show where we have spent our money.

This time, I want to look ahead, to see where we are aiming, to see where we will spend our money over the next four years.

We would spend in 1986-87 nearly three and a quarter billion dollars of state taxes, an increase of 679 million new dollars over what we are spending this year.

Most of the increase goes to education: 41% over four years for higher education; 37% for public schools.

This compares with 25% for higher education and 27% for public schools over the last four years. . . a four-year period when inflation was double what it should be in the next four.

Growth in spending for our traditionally out-of-control spending programs -- medicaid and corrections -- is estimated at just below the overall four-year growth of the general fund, or 34%.

I propose to reduce our debt by another \$150 million over the four-year period and reduce the number of state employee positions by another 1,200.

This four-year plan would spend every available penny on aiming us in the right direction.

If this is the direction we need to go, when should we start?

A number of you, including most of the legislative leaders, have said that now is not time for a general tax increase. When 288,000 Tennesseans or more than 13% of us are out of work, everybody who has a job is lucky.

Without a general tax increase this would be the barest boned budget in my five years. There would be no state money for pay raises. We would have to cut some departments that have been cut several times or eliminate others that the Legislature frankly doesn't want eliminated.

There is another side to the argument.

If a period of 13% unemployment is the wrong time to raise taxes, it is also the time to get started with whatever it takes to get better jobs. Better jobs come from better schools and better schools cost more money spent a different way.

So, my recommendation is in two parts:

First, for the rest of calendar year 1983, the first half of the budget year, it will be a bare-bones, no-frills, cutback budget. There will be no general tax increase and no pay raise. It shows compassion for the taxpayer in a bad economy. When 288,000 taxpayers are out of work, a budget that asks government to tighten its belt even tighter makes sense.

Second, for the last half of the next budget year -- starting January 1, 1984 -- and the three years thereafter, we need to get moving on better schools, jobs, prisons, clean water, healthy children and decent salaries for state employees and university personnel. The economy is clearly improving. 1984 may be the best economic year of the decade. And we simply can't wait any longer to get started on what we must do.

There is money in the budget plan for new job development, including recruiting high technology industry and expanding agricultural research.

There are three important initiatives to keep Tennessee a clean and pleasant place to live -- hazardous waste management, natural area protection and state park maintenance.

There is up to \$5 million a year by the fourth year to complete the pre-natal health care program.

There is up to \$20 million a year by the fourth year for prisons.

There are new funds to fight illegal drug traffic.

A \$267 million five-year capital outlay program is part of the summary. It is conservative. Most of it goes to keep in good shape what we've already got. There are important projects which are continued -- the Technical Institute in Knoxville and the UT Library -- and others which should be completed quickly, like the Fogelman College of Business in Memphis.

The budget plan ultimately adds \$358 million in new pay and benefit increases for state employees, higher education personnel and public school teachers.

There is a total of \$37 million for pay and benefits in the first year.

This will pay for:

- teachers' training and experience programs,
- state employees' longevity, and
- the state's share of employees' health insurance costs plus one-half of the 40% increase in health insurance premium cost that will hit state employees this year. This means the state employee cost-sharing ratio becomes 65-35 instead of 60-40.

With 288,000 taxpayers out of work, there is no state money for pay increases for the first six months of this budget year.

But beginning January 1, 1984, we should move toward normal pay increases as the economy gets back to normal.

Therefore, there is enough money for an average 2.5% pay increase beginning January 1, 1984.

Then for the second, third and fourth years there is room in the budget plan for average increases in employee pay and benefit costs in the range of five to six percent each year.

Figuring what is a fair pay increase always depends on revenue growth and is never easy to do.

One measure is to compare public employees with all taxpayers. Tennessee teachers, for example, make 82% of the national average teachers' salaries. All Tennessee taxpayers also make 82% of the national average salary for all taxpayers.

As the average salaries of all taxpayers go up, it is fair to expect similar average increases for public employees.

This budget is not content just with improving one average.

There are completely separate pay programs which are in addition to across-the-board pay increases:

- Much of the new money for higher education goes for additional pay increases based on performance.

- There is \$20 million extra by the fourth year -- including \$2 million for this year -- for our new job classification system to move state employees' pay closer to what their skills would bring in the private marketplace.

- Finally, the Master Teacher and Principal Program is all in addition to across-the-board raises. It would begin carefully by selecting the first 75 of Tennessee's finest teachers and principals. The first cost: \$2.1 million. The fourth year cost when 15,225 teachers may be involved: \$116 million.

More than anything else, this four-year budget plan is a Better Schools budget plan: 207 million new annual dollars by 1986-87.

It has:

- Money to put BASIC SKILLS FIRST fully in place in 1,100 schools;

- \$7 million to make sure every child learns computer skills before the ninth grade;

- \$7 million for mandatory kindergarten;

- \$1.7 million this year and \$15.7 million in the next three to hire more math and science teachers;

- summer programs for gifted students, new vocational equipment, music for the early grades, alternative classrooms for disruptive students . . . all to start this year;

- \$4.6 million new this year for textbooks for new job skills, \$20 million for university centers of excellence and 45 million other new dollars for higher education.

What we need to do still takes about \$372 million more dollars than our tax structure will bring in by the fourth year, 1986-87.

To pay the bill, I recommend you enact a one-half cent sales tax increase effective January 1, 1984, and another one-half cent effective January 1, 1985. I also recommend smaller revenue measures to take effect July 1, 1983: a one percent increase in insurance premium tax, and tax on video games and converting to sales tax the gross receipts tax on vending machine sales.

Enact the sales tax increase now. Collect only as we can afford it and need it.

Even after these taxes are fully in place, Tennessee state government will take a smaller percentage of its taxpayers' personal income than any other Southern state.

It makes common sense to look ahead four years, arrange now to pay for all the program -- like Master Teacher -- that we start, and take the money only as you need it.

Speaker McWerter has suggested that we phase in slowly what we need to do.

Governor Wilder has been very strong on arranging (how) to pay for whatever new programs we start.

The phase-in also helps to keep our sales tax from getting too much higher than that of neighboring states.

Neither do I recommend trying in this busy session to deal with tax reform . . . except for phasing out most of the inheritance tax reducing revenues by \$24 million by the fourth year. We should deal with these questions, but at a time when it is true reform and not just an excuse to raise more money.

There is one other very important thing:

I am not for the sales tax increase if it is for more of the same.

In my State of Education Address in January, I said I would veto, campaign against and oppose any general tax increase that did not include the Master Teacher Program.

I had never made a statement quite like that before.

After that, my Mother called. She gave me some advice: "Don't go around giving ultimatums", she said. "It sounds like you are getting too big for your britches."

So let me say carefully where I stand. I don't mean it as an ultimatum. But I do want you and my mother and the teachers, parents and taxpayers of Tennessee to understand just how deeply I feel committed to the Better Schools and Master Teacher Programs.

Any budget without them would not assure the kind of progress we must have in the schools to justify a tax increase. That is why I have said I would veto a tax increase without the programs. We must produce better schools and we need a tax increase to do it. But we should not increase taxes if we don't produce better schools.

By the way, my mother is not just a parent. She, like my father, a former teacher and a taxpayer. She and dad both support the Master Teacher Program. In addition to her advice to me, she has written her legislators, Senator Koella and Representative Anderson, and given them some advice: vote for it.

This is National Teachers Day.

I am proud of our teachers, including my parents. They work hard, don't complain much and have one of the most important jobs in our state.

I understand that teachers and schools can't do it all. If I could figure out a "Better Homes" program it would do more good than any "Better Schools" program.

But we can do something about the schools.

Better schools mean better jobs.

And better teachers mean better schools.

Our aim should be to have the most professional teaching career in America . . .right here in Tennessee.

The truth is we are behind on jobs and schools in Tennessee.

Someone needs to say so and someone needs to do something about it.

I can make a big noise. I can spend the next four years going to every civic club, every PTA, every street corner with the Better Schools crusade.

But the civic club members, the parents, the teachers, the taxpayers and I don't have a single vote in the Senate or in the House.

The 132 Tennesseans who can do the most to change the course of our lives are sitting right in this Chamber.

Tennessee needs to aim in the right direction.

You can aim us.

Tennessee then needs to move now in the right direction.

If we don't, we'll get worse as the country gets better off.

You can move us.

This is not an ordinary moment.

It is an historic moment.

You have a chance based upon the work you have already done and the budget and legislation you can approve now to move from the back of the line to the front.

We can throw up our hands and say it's just not worth the effort -- and be satisfied trailing the pack.

Or we can be first for a change.

Either way you will make history in these Chambers this year.

And I predict that this Legislature and its leaders will go down in history as the finest, most progressive General Assembly that ever served the people of Tennessee.

APPENDIX C
ANNOTATED RESOURCE DIRECTORY

Appendix C

Annotated Resource Directory

State Department (Overview)

The State Department of Education has been instrumental in the development of Tennessee's new Career Ladder Program. The Commissioner of Education has been a part of the governor's planning force for what began as the Master Teacher Program, and is now the Career Ladder, from its inception prior to the governor's speech in January of 1983. Many people from the various departments within the State Department joined forces to work on this program. The office for Research and Development (R & D) spent a major part of their time beginning in the Fall of 1983, in developing an evaluation instrument that would be ready to field test in the Winter of 1984. An Interim Commission was appointed by the governor to function as part of the State Department for the purpose of devising a means of evaluating the best teachers in the state, determining how to choose them, and selecting the first group. Recommendations from the Interim Commission were given to the Select Committee on Education who in turn reported its findings to the House and Senate for consideration of a comprehensive education reform bill. The Better Schools Office was created within the State Department of Education to function as the base for the

program. Mailings were sent to teachers across the state from this office to inform them about the various proceedings for the new and upcoming career ladder; a teacher study council was formed to represent teacher input from across the state regarding the evaluation criteria and process of the career ladder; a hotline was established, staffed by personnel in the Better Schools Office, to answer questions that various people and organizations had concerning the Career Ladder Program; and, a speaking tour for various counties in Tennessee was set up as a means for personnel in the Better Schools Office to promote the program.

Reference Guide

Addresses:

Dr. Robert MacElrath, Commissioner
State Department of Education
100 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 27219

For information concerning the Career Ladder Program,
write to:

Dr. Russell French (Career Teacher Program)
Better Schools Office
214 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 37219

Dr. Francis Trusty (Career Administrator Program)
Better Schools Office
214 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 37219

Better Schools
Hotline: 1-800-342-5005

Selected Materials

1983

April - First organizational meeting

Research on teacher effectiveness and teacher competencies were reviewed to be refined by Interim Commission

I.C. was divided into four subcommittees 1.)

Application Porcedures 2.) Interview Procedures

3.) Candidate's Portfolio 4.) Criteria Analysis

May - Commissioner announced that \$40,000 had been appropriated for the operation of the I.C.

Discussions included criteria for administrator career program, how teacher and parent input would be utilized and other pertinent information concerning development of evaluation and selection of master teachers and administrators.

June - University professors from the University of

Tennessee, Knoxville, appointed to direct developoment of teacher and administrator evaluation criteria. Four subcommittees met and reviewed a draft of teacher competencies as submitted by two consultants, sample portfolio application and interview forms, and discussed selection of initial interviewers.

July - Reviewed a working copy of teacher competencies to be sent out to teachers for comment and input. Areas of student achievement and knowledge of subject matter were still controversial issues.

August-Preliminary data from Teachers' Study Council meetings were being positively received by teachers. Reaction to samples of instruments from the Stallings System was of concern that they were too elaborate for a statewide system. Selection of initial master teachers/administrators was discussed.

September-Progress report on administrator competencies was given. Consideration was given to identification of competencies for evaluation of teachers and support staff other than regular classroom teachers. Commission voted for provisions in the program to include that master teachers/administrators be proficient in spoken and written English.

October - Several people were invited to give presentations before the I.C. for research and background information needed to make a decision on concerning selection of an observation/evaluation instrument(s). The State Department Staff was given the go-ahead to develop an

evaluation instrument. I.C. gave approval to competencies.

December- The State Department was scheduled to be ready with complete teacher evaluation system for field testing.

Observational procedures were approved.

The Commission approved authorization for State Department staff to field test weighting and scoring systems and to make recommendations to Criteria Analysis Subcommittee Request for teacher and administrator systems to use similar frameworks and terminology.

The following is a list of those persons who testified before the Select Committee on Education.

Dr. Jay Robinson, Superintendent,
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Charlotte, NC

Dr. Phillip Schlechty, Professor of Education
University of North Carolina

Jerry Blair, Superintendent, Lake Placid Schools
Lake Placid, NY

Ms. Linda Bond, Senate Education Committee
California General Assembly

Dr. Robert Saunders, Dean, College of Education
Memphis State University

Dr. Richard Wisniewski, Dean, College of Education
University of Tennessee

Dr. James Stamper, Dean of Academic Affairs
Belmont College

Dr. Eva Galambos, Task Force Staff Director
Southern Regional Education Board

Dr. Billy Reagan, Superintendent, Houston Independent
Schools
Houston, Texas

Dr. Susan Rosenholtz, Vanderbilt University

Dr. Robert McElrath, Commissioner, Department of
Education

Dr. Roy Stinnett, Dean, College of Education,
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Dr. Lynton Deck, Director, Learning Technology Center
Vanderbilt University

Ms. Donna Cotner, President-Elect, Tennessee Education
Association

Estel Mills, Superintendent, McNairy County Schools

Lynn Twymann, History, Huntingdon Jr. High School

Jeanette Schlaeger, English, Cleveland High School

Margeret Horsnell, Murrell School, Nashville

Jerry Frazier, Assistant Principal, Bradley County
High School

State Department of Education Staff Activities
for
Interim Commission
November-December, 1983

Since the October 31, 1983 Interim Commission meeting the State Department of Education staff has been involved in the process of creating a "synthesis" teacher evaluation program. During this six weeks, the staff has reviewed input from teachers and administrators and has consulted with leading experts in the field of teacher evaluation. The following is an outline of the major activities and of comments which staff has considered and reviewed:

- November 1 Staff met with Dr. Lester Solomon from the Georgia State Department of Education. Dr. Solomon reviewed the development and implementation of the Georgia Teacher Assessment Program.
- November 2 Staff met with Dr. Jane Stallings concerning the use of ratings for teacher evaluation. Dr. Stallings referred staff to Dr. Robert Soar, a national expert on classroom observation systems.
- November 3, 4 Staff met with Mark Smylie to work on the development of the student questionnaire.
- November 10 Staff met with Paul Hersey from the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Mr. Hersey discussed the administrator assessment model utilized by his association.
- November 17, 18 Staff met with Dr. Robert Soar, a University of Florida Professor, who specializes in the measurement of classroom behavior and research on teacher effectiveness. Dr. Soar identified the observation items as falling into three types of items: static input items, sign items, and developmental items (rating items). Dr. Soar suggested that the staff identify the types of items, reword

some competencies and indicators, reduce and add some indicators, and identify data sources for instrumentation. Dr. Soar also referred us to several experts and shared appropriate resources with us.

November 20, 21

Staff met with Dr. Jason Millman, a Cornell University Professor, who specializes in educational measurement and evaluation. Dr. Milman suggested that we reduce the number of competencies, remember that our task is to discriminate between good and best, and consider the use of written tests for obtaining evaluation data. Dr. Milman also shared the following information:

(1) Competencies/indicators should be under control of teacher;
 (2) Competencies ought to be measurable and valued by the community of concerned educators (valued vs. valid); (4) Indicators should be internally consistent;
 (5) Observation has to be of behavior to be measurable; and
 (6) Leadership and professional development are excellence measures.

December 2

Staff talked with Dr. Arthur Wise, a senior researcher at the Rand Corporation in Washington, D.C. Dr. Wise expressed the viewpoint that what was more important than instrumentation was the use of Master Teachers for observation. Dr. Wise stated that Master Teachers "... are carrying around a vision of good teaching. You have obviously captured the right people."

December 2

Staff met with Dr. George Redfern, a leading expert in personnel evaluation. Dr. Redfern highlighted the following ideas: (1) Remember that public wants a component which measures student outcomes;
 (2) Recognize that effective

teaching research is important but do not be misled into thinking that research is complete or is more than it really is; (3) Task is to discriminate between good and outstanding teachers; (4) Areas to consider for teacher evaluation include: teaching strategies, classroom management, teacher knowledge base, liberal education of teacher which underlies subject matter and pedagogy, interpersonal skills, learning outcomes, written and oral communication skills.

December 6

Staff met with Dr. Susan Rosenholtz and Mark Smylie to review a draft listing of competencies and indicators. Dr. Rosenholtz had concern about changes made by staff and was to review the list and meet with staff on Friday to discuss the issues. Dr. Rosenholtz has since resigned her position due to proposed changes suggested by field input from teachers, by the Interim Commission and by nationally known consultants.

December 7, 8

Staff met with Dr. James Popham, a Professor at U.C.L.A. Dr. Popham is a leading authority on criterion reference measurement and program evaluation. Dr. Robert Soar was also present. Dr. Popham stated that he thought Tennessee had the potential for a "crackerjack" evaluation system and was impressed with the multiple data sources concept. However, Dr. Popham felt the system has one major flaw and that was an attempt to measure everything. He suggested that we drastically reduce the competencies and indicators. He said, "to try to measure everything is in reality to measure nothing." Dr. Popham suggested that the competencies focus on the major things teachers do: Planning Instruction, Delivering Instruction, and Evaluating Instruction. Also included are

classroom management, leadership, and communication skills. Dr. Soar agreed with Dr. Popham that a need exists to reduce the number of competencies and indicators.

December 8

Staff met with the Madeline Hunter Team working in Tennessee. The team reviewed the competencies and indicators, liked the rearrangement of format, and suggested improved wording of some indicators.

December 9

Staff met with Dr. Jane Stallings to discuss current progress. Dr. Stallings agreed that the number of competencies and indicators needed to be reduced and thought the concept of classroom climate was important for inclusion. Dr. Stallings felt that her schedule did not permit involvement in instrument development, but that she would be pleased to serve as a consultant and "sounding board" as we work out the details of the system. Dr. Stallings suggested using her observation system on a small sample to cross-validate the new system.

Consultants to
State Department of Education
on
Career Teacher/Administrator Program

Dr. W. James Popham

Professor, College of Education
University of California at Los Angeles
and
Director, Instructional Objectives Exchange

Dr. Popham is a leading expert in the area of criterion reference measurement and program evaluation. He is past president of the American Education Research Association. Dr. Popham has authored over 200 articles and 12 books.

Dr. Jason Millman

Professor, College of Education
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

Dr. Jason Millman is an expert in the area of educational measurement, evaluation, and research methodology. He is editor of the recent Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Dr. Millman has been the editor-in-chief of Educational Researcher and Journal of Educational Measurement and has provided consultant services to over 30 state and national agencies.

Dr. Robert Soar

Professor, College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Dr. Robert Soar is a leading expert in the measurement of classroom behavior and research in teacher effectiveness. He has written numerous articles including "Setting Variables, Classroom Interaction, and Multiple Pupil Outcomes", "Assessing Teacher Performance from Observed Competency Indicators Defined by Classroom Teachers", and "Systematic Observation in the Classroom".

Dr. Lawrence Allamoni

Professor, Department of Educational Psychology
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Mr. Paul Hersey
Director, National Secondary School
Principals' Assessment Center
Reston Virginia 22090

Madeline Hunter-Team
Staff Development Training Program
Rowland Unified School District
Rowland Heights, California 91748

Dr. George Redfern
Consultant, Personnel Evaluation
Educational Research Services
1800 N. Kent Avenue
Arlington, Virginia 22903

Dr. Susan Rosenholtz
Assistant Professor
Teaching and Learning
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37212

Mr. Mark Smylie
Research Assistant
Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies
Nashville, Tennessee 37212

Dr. Lester Solomon
Associate Director for Performance-based Certification
Division of Staff Development
Georgia Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

Dr. Jane Stallings
Professor of Education
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37212

Dr. Arthur Wise
Senior Research Consultant on Educational Policy
Rand Corporation
Washington, D.C.

Better Schools Hotline Most Frequently Asked Questions

1. Are teachers with three years or more experience required to go through an apprentice or probationary period of several years before being certified professional, senior, or master teacher?

No, teachers with three years or more experience may apply for professional, senior, or master teacher status as long as they meet the requirements of years experience.

For instance, a teacher with four years experience may apply for a professional certificate without first being certified at the apprentice level.

2. How will the Master Teacher Program impact upon tenure and bargaining?

Tenure and negotiation remain local concerns. A local board of education may still grant tenure at the end of the probationary period and local school systems will still negotiate with the approved bargaining agent.

The Master Teacher Program does, however, have an interesting impact upon negotiation. That is, the bill creates additional areas that could be negotiated. For example, the bargaining agent could negotiate multiple year contracts for members at the various incentive levels (Section 49-15-214 or Section 49-15-304 to 49-15-306). Furthermore, the agent could negotiate "appropriate" activities for those who elect extended time options. Perhaps the area of negotiation that has the potential for the greatest impact is related to "the quota." It is possible for the bargaining unit to negotiate for incentive positions above those levels established by the state budget.

3. What's happening to the input given by teachers on the proposed evaluation criteria at the Teachers' Study Council?

The input from the worksheets was compiled and analyzed at the Department of Education. Results from the worksheets were turned over to the Interim Commission for study. Results will also be presented to the Legislative Study Group.

The miscellaneous comments which were gathered are currently being put into report form, and this will also be presented to the Interim Commission as well as the Legislative Study Group.

4. What's the future of the Teachers' Study Council?

The Teachers' Study Council will meet again in the Fall to further explore the evaluative process and the evaluation instrument.

Currently, Study Council members are meeting with their faculties to present the proposed evaluative criteria and report back with additional input.

The Study Council will continue to meet and address other concerns in education throughout the coming year.

5. What about the "quotas?"

On any legislation, appropriation limits are set. The percentages designating master and senior teachers in the legislation were used to set those spending limits.

Currently, the Legislative Study Group is studying the "quotas." Also, Department of Education staff is determining the number of teachers eligible for senior and master teacher certification from each school system based on years of experience.

6. What about the evaluation and inclusion into the Master Teacher/Master Administrator Program of guidance counselors, assistant principals, librarians, and others not specifically addressed in the program?

All certified personnel will be eligible for inclusion into the program.

Currently, individuals representing vocational education teachers, guidance counselors, librarians and others are meeting with Department of Education staff and Interim Commission members to develop appropriate career steps and evaluation processes.

7. What about teachers already teaching 11 or 12 month contracts? How will they be paid?

Those particular circumstances are also being addressed by the State Department, Interim Commission, and representatives from appropriate groups.

8. Who are the "Tennesseans for Better Schools?"

The "Tennesseans for Better Schools" is a statewide group that has been organized to channel support for the Better Schools Program to members of the Tennessee General Assembly.

The bi-partisan group is headed by Mr. Fred Dettwiller of Nashville. Mrs. Flo Alexander, mother of Governor Laqmar Alexander, and Frank Clement, Jr., son of the late Governor Frank Clement, are serving as Co-Chairpersons of the founders committee. Bob Weaver, Debbie Tate, and Cindy Ingram are serving as staff to that group. All staff and expenses are being paid from funds raised by "Tennesseans for Better Schools."

Currently television commercials plugging the Better Schools program are being aired statewide. These commercials are also being paid for by "Tennesseans for Better Schools."

In addition, the group is attempting to gather over 100,000 signatures on petitions supporting the program.

9. How will the first group of master teachers and master administrators be selected?

The Ad Hoc Interim Certification Commission is currently wrestling with the procedures needed to select and initial small group of master teachers and administrators as indicated in the proposed legislation. Their current thinking suggests a process such as the following:

Step 1: Applications open to all who have sufficient years of experience and feel they meet criteria.

Step 2: Commission and staff determine eligibility of applicants based on criteria specified in legislation.

Step 3: Eligible applicants become part of a

common pool.

- Step 4: A random selection process is used to identify twice, the number of candidates as stipulated for master status in the legislation.
- Step 5: Conduct interviews, observations and collect all other data needed for decision.
- Step 6: Select master teachers and administrators on the basis of evaluation data.
- Step 7: If number of teachers and administrators qualifying does not match the number of slots provided in the legislation, repeat steps 4 through 6.

10. What does the sentence in the bill mean that says, "In case of conflict between this chapter and any other law, the provisions of this chapter shall prevail?"

This statement does not supercede any legislation dealing with tenure or negotiations. It does supercede legislation dealing with certification. The reason for this taking preimminence over other certification regulations is that the statement's purpose is to remove any conflicts that might exist with former certification requirements.

Representative Steve Cobb (D-Nashville), one of the bill's sponsors and a practicing attorney, recently made the clarification as stated above in a local television show. He further stated that he would remove the statement from the bill if it caused undue concern to any party.

11. What is the purpose of the Master Teacher Program?

The program is an incentive pay system designed to make teaching a fully professional career, to draw our best young people into it, to keep our best teachers in it, to challenge our best teachers to do even better, and to inspire excellence in our classrooms by rewarding excellence in our teachers.

12. How high are the proposed new salaries?
Tennessee Senior and Master Teachers will be among the best paid, if not the best paid, public school

teachers in the country. An average Tennessee Senior Teacher (10 years experience with a Master's Degree) will make \$20,812, a 30% increase in this year's state's share of that salary and nearly as much as the national average.

An average Master Teacher (15 years experience and a Master's Degree) will make \$26,873, a 60% increase in this year's state's share of the salary. This is about 5,000 more than the national average teacher's salary.

13. How does the Master Teacher Program affect me as a teacher?

Not at all, unless you want to participate in the program. You can continue as you are the rest of your life and never be affected by it. On the other hand, we expect most teachers will be eager to participate.

14. How does a teacher apply for certification as a Senior or Master Teacher?

Participation in the program is voluntary. A teacher will begin by applying directly to the state Master Teacher Certification Commission.

15. Does a school system have to participate in the Master Teacher Program?

No. However, it will benefit the local system to participate as there is no local cost involved in the program. The state will pay 100% of the costs of the program -- including additional salary costs.

16. How does the Master Teacher Program affect base pay and across-the-board raises?

The Master Teacher Program is completely separate from the annual base pay and across-the-board raises granted by either the state or local school system. It is extra pay. The Legislature will continue to decide each year -- as it does now -- what across-the-board pay raises should provide.

17. How soon will the program begin?

If the Legislature approves, the program will begin July 1 but phase in slowly over four years. First,

the Interim Commission on Master Teacher Certification will develop guidelines sometime after July 1, 1983. By January 1, 1984, there will be 25 Master Teachers and Principals picked in each of the three grand divisions. The idea would be to go slowly enough so that the process could be carefully looked at and improved as it continues. The program will be fully operational by the 1986-87 school year.

18. Is a master's degree required to become a Senior or Master Teacher?

No.

19. How many Senior or Master Teacher positions will there be?

The state will pay for the higher salaries for about 15,000 or 35% of all Tennessee's public school teachers.

20. Is this 35% number an inflexible quota?

Not at all. The number was selected for the first four years of the program. Depending on our experience with the program, the Legislature could agree to pay for more Senior and Master Teachers after 1986-87. Hopefully, local governments will be so impressed with the program's impact on the quality of the public school system that they will want to hire extra Senior or Master Teachers. A Senior or Master Teacher may, of course, teach in another school district if a state-paid slot is not available in the district where that teacher lives. Many teachers -- for example, young parents -- who are Master Teachers will probably prefer, for the time being, to arrange for a 10-month or 11-month contract so that they can spend more time with their young children. All of these are new options that will be available to teachers under the Master Teacher Program and which are not available now.

21. How will the Senior and Master Teacher positions be allocated to schools systems across the state?

Each school district will get its share of the state-paid positions based upon the number of certified professional personnel in the system.

This should especially help poorer, rural school districts in Tennessee by giving those districts a chance for the first time to pay a large number of its teachers salaries high enough so they can compete with the more urban school districts. The allocation of Master and Senior Teacher positions within the system will be determined locally, as it is today.

22. If I am now a certified Tennessee Public school teacher and do not seek Senior or Master Teacher status, will the existing rules for certification renewal still apply to me?

Yes. Again, the new program is not designed to have any impact on anyone teaching today unless the teacher wants to join.

23. How will the Master Teacher Program apply to persons in specialty areas such as physical education, special education, vocational education, art and music, or to school-wide positions such as counselors and librarians?

The plan is being developed so that every teacher -- regardless of his or her certification area -- will be able to participate. A person will apply in the field in which he or she is currently assigned. However, once a Senior or Master Certificate is granted, the certificate will be valid for its duration regardless of the teacher's specific assignment by the local board.

24. Can a secondary school counselor or school psychologist who is employed by a local school system -- but does not hold a professional teaching certificate -- apply for certification as a Senior or Master Teacher?

Yes. They will be evaluated by a core of Master Teacher level personnel with expertise in the area being evaluated and will be observed in the setting in which they normally conduct their responsibilities.

25. Who pays the cost of the substitute teacher that when a Senior or Master Teacher is required to evaluate other teachers outside the school system?

The state will pay all costs incurred by local school systems for release of teachers to conduct evaluations under this program. The state will also cover all expenses incurred for travel by Master Teachers in connection with the evaluation assignments.

26. Will employing a substitute for the Master Teacher defeat the ideal of using a Master Teacher in the classroom?

No. A Master Teacher may be out of the classroom for other professional duties a maximum of five days per year.

27. If my certification as a Senior or Master Teacher is not renewed by the State Certification Commission after five years, will I lose my former certification as a Professional Teacher?

No. Teachers with existing certification as classroom teachers will not lose this status as a result of a non-renewal of the Senior or Master certification.

28. How will certification under the new program affect my existing tenure rights?

This program affects certification. It makes no change in the tenure law. Certification is between the teacher and the state. Tenure is a relationship between the teacher and the local board of education.

29. If an Apprentice Teacher receives tenure after three years of teaching, but does not qualify for the Professional Teacher Certificate within the required five-year period, what happens?

The person will no longer be eligible for employment since all teachers must have a valid teaching certificate.

30. Would a Teacher receive more leave as a Senior or Master Teacher?

Yes one day of sick leave and one day of annual leave will be allowed for each additional month of employment.

31. As a Master Teacher, will I be required to sign a

12-month contract?

No. The plan provides for 10-month and 11-month contracts for Master Teachers. The amount of the supplement will depend on the length of the contract.

32. Won't the Senior or Master Teacher program create professional jealousy among teachers within a school or cause them to stop sharing their best ideas with each other?

Anyone who aspires to be certified as a Senior or Master Teacher must demonstrate a commitment to the improvement of instructional quality for all educators. That includes the sharing of ideas across the classroom, school and school system lines.

33. What is the difference between the Master Teacher Program and a "merit pay" system?

When teachers think of merit pay, they usually think of systems that have been tried in other states in which principals or other local groups have given annual bonuses based on classroom performance. This concept was abandoned as simply too divisive and not very workable given the present status of evaluation procedures in most Tennessee school districts. The Master Teacher Program differs from traditional merit pay in two important ways. First, it rewards exceptional performance as measured over a longer term: five years. Second, the measurement of the quality of classroom teaching over that period of time is done by Master Teachers from outside the evaluated teacher's school district in an effort to try to minimize or eliminate the problems that sometime occur with local politics.

34. How can poorer and more remote school systems compete for Master and Senior Teachers? Wouldn't all the better teachers be attracted to the more affluent systems?

The Master Teacher Program is the best opportunity a poorer school district has to pay the kind of salaries that will help keep and attract the best teachers. Every school district gets its pro-rata share of the state's money for Senior or Master Teachers. The extra pay a Senior or Master Teacher will receive will be just as great in a poorer school district as it is in the wealthiest school system.

35. Do I still get a vacation if I sign a 12-month contract as a Master Teacher?

Yes. Your sick leave and annual leave will be increased by one day's sick leave and one day's annual leave for each additional month of employment. The Master Teacher contract is for twelve 20-day periods or 240 days.

36. Why doesn't the state take the money it proposes to spend on Master and Senior Teachers and use it to hire more regular teachers with smaller class sizes?

Tennessee is losing too many of its best, experienced teachers and not attracting as many of the best qualified students to colleges of education. The primary reason is pay: teachers looking forward to very little financial gain. A 40-year teacher who is the best in the system may make only \$3,000 or \$4,000 more than the newest teacher. The best teacher may make the same salary as the worst teacher.

37. How does sick leave or maternity leave affect a five-year certification? Does that count against the time that I have to renew my certificate?

Consideration is being given to extending the five-year certificate to allow for emergencies and/or sickness and periods of unemployment. The teacher may be given additional time to make up for any unforeseen circumstances equal to the time missed for these emergencies.

38. Is it fair to a young teacher to have to wait six years or more to get a big pay raise for being an excellent teacher? Can we expect to attract bright students not teaching when they have to wait so long to get good pay?

Yes. As is the case with most professional careers, pay for teachers under the Master Teacher Program will not be exceptional for the first years in the classroom. These years are a time for proving one's abilities and sharpening professional skills. However, teachers who participate and excel in the Master Teacher Program can anticipate a much brighter future.

39. What happens to a Master or Senior Teacher if his or her certificate is not renewed at the end of five years.

A Senior Teacher likely will revert to the Professional Teacher Certificate which will continue in force. The Master Teacher could revert to Senior Teacher status. The program also provides appeal through the Master Teacher Certification Commission if renewal is denied.

40. Could a teacher continue his or her education after becoming a Senior or Master Teacher while required to work on an 11-month or 12-month contract?

Yes. This could be done with careful planning. The 11-month contract calls for 220 work days; the 12-month contract for 240 days.

41. Will recertification require a specific number of hours of study as the 10-year certificates do?

The recertification will be primarily based on continuing satisfactory performance, rather than "paper credentials."

42. Why limit the number of Master Teachers to 10%, or the number of Senior Teachers to 25%? Why can't all teachers who meet the experience and quality guidelines get the Senior and Master Certificates?

There is no limit of issuance of Senior and Master Teacher Certificates. Initially, the state will pay for the first 10% for master Teachers and the first 25% for Senior Teachers. A local school system could choose to pay for additional Senior or Master Teachers. The Legislature could at a later time decide to increase those percentages.

43. How does the Master Teacher Program affect my retirement benefits? Will my retirement income be determined by base pay, or will it include the supplement I receive as a Senior or Master Teacher?

Retirement benefits are determined by total salary which includes the pay increment for Senior or Master status.

44. Will a teacher lose tenure by leaving his or her present school district to take a Senior or Master

Teacher position in another school district?

Tenure is not affected by this program. The teacher's certification will be transferable within the state. Tenure is transferable within the state if a local board of education elects to do so.

45. After Governor Alexander's term ends, what will happen to the Master Teacher Program?

The concept of rewarding outstanding teachers has been recommended by the Legislature's own Comprehensive Education Study. Furthermore, an outstanding program -- successfully implemented over a four-period of time -- becomes an acceptable and desirable standard. It is highly unlikely that this program, once successfully implemented, will lose momentum and be phased out. It is a new, exciting, and innovative approach which provides additional incentives to outstanding classroom teachers.

46. Specifically, what process will be used to evaluate a new applicant as a Senior Teacher? Will the same process be used to evaluate the applicant for renewal of certificate?

A panel of three Master Teachers will be assigned to evaluate each applicant. One of the most important parts of their evaluation will be to observe the applicant. The Master Teacher Certification Commission will develop other criteria that will be used. The evaluation team and the Regional Commission will, of course, be interested in the opinions of those who know the teacher best, including the principals, superintendents, other teachers, and parents. These individuals will not make the final recommendation, but their views will be carefully considered.

Panel members will make their observations of the applicant individually on two separate occasions. The evaluation time requires a minimum of one-half day for each visit. In addition, an interview will be conducted to discuss the applicants assignment, unit and daily lesson plans, background information about students, and progress of students. For renewal of Senior or Master Teacher certificates, this process will occur twice during the life of the certificate (twice during the five-year period).

Copies of the evaluations will be given to each applicant.

47. If I apply for Senior or Master Teacher status as an intrinsic reward or if I receive Senior or Master Teacher status by my school system does not have an opening for this position, and I continue to be employed as a regular or Professional Teacher, can my Senior or Master Teacher certification be renewed after five years?

Yes. Evaluations are based on teaching performance. If your performance remains at an acceptable level, the Senior or Master Teacher status could be renewed even if you continue to accept employment as a Professional Teacher.

48. How will evaluations be conducted by the Master Teachers?

The State Department of Education is now developing an observation instrument and other evaluation criteria based upon research into effective schools. The focus of the evaluations will be effective classroom performance or effectiveness in carrying out assigned responsibilities. Master Teachers will receive training from the state in evaluation procedures.

49. How will student achievement be measured as part of the evaluation process?

Student achievement is an important part of a teacher's evaluation, but it is only one part. How student achievement scores are used will vary from class to class, school to school, city to city. Student achievement will be looked at over a five-year period using available teacher data, including pre-tests, standardized achievement tests and other information related to student learning. For example, handicapped or disadvantaged students have special needs and place special demands on a classroom teacher. No one will understand those requirements better than another Master Teacher.

50. What are some of the other factors that will be considered in the evaluation process?

Evaluations will involve interviews with the teacher who is applying for the new certificate and will take

into consideration such factors as objectives of the teacher, classroom environment, local funding limitations, the types of students enrolled in the class being observed, and the professional opinions of principals, the local board of education, and others who know the teacher best.

51. Who will assign the evaluation teams?

The Regional Commissions.

52. How will members of the evaluation team be selected?

From the list of Master Teachers in that region.

53. Can a member of an evaluation team decline to participate in the review of a specific teacher for personal reasons?

Yes.

54. Can the teacher being evaluated eliminate an individual on his or her evaluation team for similar personal reasons?

Yes.

55. May I, as a teacher under the current system, sign up for the Master Teacher Program and then change my mind?

Yes. Presently employed teachers may sign up for the Master Teacher Program and later return to the old system. They may exercise this option only once.

APPENDIX D
TEACHERS' STUDY COUNCIL

Appendix D

Teachers' Study Council

The Teachers' Study Council (TCS) was developed under the authorization of the State Department of Education, in August, 1983, for the stated purpose of providing classroom teachers a means of input in communicating their ideas and opinions on various issues and viewpoints. The initial task of the TSC was to provide feedback regarding the evaluation criteria and instrumentation to be used in the new Career Ladder Program. Tennessee is divided into nine Development Districts, each of which is served by a staff member of the State Department of Education and represents seventeen Area Study Councils. The procedure calls for the local school systems to elect three representatives (Chairperson, Chairperson-elect, and Secretary/Treasurer) to serve on the Area Council and each school within the local system to elect teachers to serve on the building steering committee based on the following ratio:

<u>Number of Teachers</u>	<u>Number of Representatives</u>
<u>in School</u>	
1-19	2
20-39	3
40 or more	5

189

Reference Guide

1. Constitution and By-Laws of the Tennessee Teachers'

Study Council
State Department of Education
Cordell Hull Building
Nashville

2. District and Area Teacher Study Council Officers

State Department of Education

Selected Materials

Overview of Teacher Study Council Activities:

1983August - October:

Area Councils met twice, in most cases, to review State Department's proposed draft of evaluation criteria for Career Ladder Program.

November:

Representatives from the 17 Area Teachers' Study Councils met in Murfreesboro. Teachers expressed a need to concentrate more on recommendations made by the Select Committee on Education and less on specifics generated by the Interim Commission. The Committee on Future Program Ideas and Plans recommended eleven issues of immediate concern to teachers in Tennessee. The committee on Extended Contracts recommended appropriate teaching and non-teaching responsibilities on extended contracts.

1984

January:

Area Study Councils reviewed sample items in the final draft of the evaluation instrument, as presented by State Department of Education staff. These were being readied for field testing in March. An audio tape accompanied the script that each teacher received describing major components of the instrument and items that had formerly been flagged as being problem areas as far as teachers were concerned. These items had either been revised or deleted altogether.

Representatives from the 17 Area Councils met in Murfreesboro. Discussions centered on the evaluation instrument for the Career Ladder Program. Questionnaires were given to area representatives by grant project staff asking for input on roles/responsibilities as a council member and how teachers from respective areas were responding to various duties/information concerning the new program.

Teachers' Study Council District Chairpersons

District Council	Chairperson
Northwest District	Beverly Cantrell Paris Special School District Oakwood Lane Paris, TN 38242
Southwest District	Betty Derryberry Route 2 Jackson, TN 38301
Memphis-Delta	
1. Memphis City Schools Council	Julia Woodward Lauderdle Elementary 995 South Lauderdale Memphis, TN 38216
2. Delta Council	Ann Bell Farmington Elementary School 2085 Cordes Road Germantown, TN 38138
South Central District	
1. Columbia Area Council	Suzanne Ingram Forrest Elementary School 1642 Orange Street Lewisburg, TN 37091
2. Motlow Area Council	Randy Wilson West Middle School 408 Primrose Tullahoma, TN 37388
Mid-Cumberland District	
1. Mid-Cumberland Council No. 1	Gail Cobb Box 155, Route 5 Clarksville, TN 37040
2. Mid Cumberland Council No. 2	Ginger Townzen 342 Belinda Parkway Mount Juliet, TN 37122
3. Metro Council	Earnestine Hazelwood Tusculum School

688 Harding Place
Nashville, TN 37211

Southeast District

1. Council No.1

Nancy Reiner
Cleveland High School
Cleveland, TN 37311

2. Council No. 2

Shirley Standefer
Box 124
Dunlap, TN 37327

East District

1. Council No.2

James F. MacLeay
Route 1, Box 511
Morristown, TN 37814

2. Council No.3

Wynona Dye
Holston High School
600 Chilhowee Drive
Knoxville, TN 37914

3. Council No. 4

Judith Lyle
902 Lakeview Drive
Kingston, TN 37763

First Tennessee District
1. Council No.1

Helen Smith
Greeneville High School
Tusculum Boulevard
Greeneville, TN 37743

2. Council No. 2

Steve Courtner
Neva Elementary
Route 5
Mountain City, TN 37683

Upper Cumberland
District

Mrs. Earnestine Edwards
Route 13, Box 108
Cookeville, TN 38501

APPENDIX E
LIST OF NEWSPAPERS

Appendix E

List of Newspapers

Chattanooga News Free Press - Chattanooga, TN
Chattanooga Times - Chattanooga, TN
Kingsport Times - Kingsport, TN
Knoxville Journal - Knoxville, TN
Knoxville News Sentinel - Knoxville, TN
Jackson Sun - Jackson, TN
Memphis Press Semitar - Memphis, TN
Bristol Herald Courier - Bristol, TN
Memphis Commercial Appeal - Memphis, TN
Johnson City Press Chronicle - Johnson City, TN
Tennessee Press Association
Nashville Banner - Nashville, TN
The Tennessean - Nashville, TN

APPENDIX F
COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1984

AN ACT to enact the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, and to revise, amend, and repeal provisions of Tennessee Code Annotated, as necessary.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. This Act shall be known and may be cited as the "Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984".

SECTION 2. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, is amended by adding Sections 3 through 76 of this Act as a new chapter, divided into a part on general provisions, consisting of Sections 3 through 13, a part on certification, consisting of Sections 14 through 25, a part on the career ladder for teachers, consisting of Sections 26 through 39, a part on the career ladder for principals and assistant principals, consisting of Sections 40 through 53, a part on the career ladder for supervisors, consisting of Sections 54 through 62, and a part on teacher training consisting of Sections 63 through 72, and a part on the principal-administrator academy, consisting of Sections 73 through 76.

SECTION 3.

(a) The purpose of this chapter is to establish a professional career ladder program for full time teachers, principals and supervisors.

(b) (1) The career teacher program shall consist of probationary teacher, apprentice teacher, professional teacher, senior teacher, and distinguished senior teacher positions. The career ladder program shall be designed to promote staff development among teachers, and to reward with substantial pay supplements those teachers evaluated as outstanding and who may accept additional responsibilities as applicable.

(2) The career principal program shall consist of provisional principal, senior principal, and distinguished senior principal positions. The career ladder shall be designed to improve the administrative skills of principals, and reward with substantial pay supplements those principals evaluated as outstanding.

(3) The career assistant principal program shall consist of provisional assistant principal, senior assistant principal and distinguished senior principal positions. The career ladder shall be designed to improve the administrative skills of assistant principals and to reward with substantial pay supplements those assistant principals evaluated as outstanding.

(4) The career supervisor program shall consist of provisional supervisor, senior supervisor, and distinguished senior supervisor positions. The career ladder shall be designed to improve the skills of administrative supervisors, and reward with substantial pay supplements those supervisors evaluated as outstanding.

(c) In each career ladder program, the professional teacher certificate, the senior principal or assistant principal certificate and the senior supervisor certificate shall be the basic certificates and all upper level certificates shall be supplementary to the basic certificate.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this chapter, the following terms have the following meanings unless the context requires otherwise:

(1) "Academy" means the principal-administrator academy created by the Act.

(2) "Apprentice Teacher" means a person who has completed satisfactory service as a probationary teacher and who holds an apprentice teacher certificate issued by the State Certification Commission.

(3) "Assistant Principal" means a person who serves in a position covered by the provisions of Section 46 whether designated as assistant principal, associate principal, deputy principal, vice principal, or otherwise.

(4) "Career level teacher" means a person who has been employed as an apprentice teacher for not less than three (3) years and who holds a professional teacher certificate, senior teacher certificate or distinguished senior teacher certificate issued by the State Certification Commission.

(5) "Career level principal" means a person who holds a senior principal or distinguished senior principal certificate issued by the State Certification Commission.

(6) "Career level assistant principal" means a person who holds a senior assistant principal or distinguished senior principal certificate issued by the State Certification Commission.

(7) "Career level supervisor" means a person who holds a senior supervisor or distinguished senior supervisor certificate issued by the State Certification Commission.

(8) "Educator" means a teacher, supervisor, assistant principal or principal eligible for certification under the provisions of this Act.

(9) "Principal" means any person employed on a full time basis by a local education agency and certified as a provisional or career level principal or assistant principal under the provisions of this

Act, or any person who is certified by the State Board of Education as a principal or assistant principal.

(10) "Probationary Teacher" means a teacher who has received a passing score on the state teacher examination and has received initial employment in a school system.

(11) "Provisional Principal" means any person who holds a provisional principal certificate issued by the State Certification Commission.

(12) "Provisional assistant principal" means any person who holds a provisional assistant principal certificate issued by the State Certification Commission.

(13) "Provisional Supervisor" means any person who holds a provisional supervisor certificate issued by the State Certification Commission.

(14) "Regional Commission" means Regional Certification Commission created by this chapter operating in any one grand division of the State.

(15) "State Certification Commission" means the State Certification Commission created by this chapter.

(16) "Supervisor" means a person involved in staff or curriculum development on a full time basis and who is included in the description of administrative supervisors formulated by the State Board of Education under the provisions of this Act.

SECTION 5. This chapter shall apply to all educators who enter the teaching profession for the first time after the effective date of this Act or who are certified as an apprentice or career level teacher or a provisional or career level principal or assistant principal or supervisor after the effective date of this Act. Educators employed at the state special schools shall be included under the provisions of this Act on the same basis as educators employed by local education agencies.

SECTION 6.

(a) For the purposes of implementing the career ladder program for teachers, any public school teacher who has been employed as a certified teacher for at least twelve (12) years on the effective date of this Act may apply for and is eligible to be considered for certification as a senior teacher or a distinguished senior teacher, and any such teacher who has been employed as a certified teacher for at least eight (8) years may apply for and is eligible to be considered for certification as a senior teacher. Any person who has been employed as a certified teacher for at least three (3) years may apply for and is eligible to be considered for certification as a professional teacher. Certification as a professional teacher shall be granted to any eligible teacher who receives a passing score on the most recent edition of the National Teacher Examination Commons or Specialty Area Tests or another secure, basic professional skills test selected by the State Certification Commission and such other requirements as the State Certification Commission may establish for this purpose. All teachers who receive the professional teacher certificate shall receive the supplement provided for professional teachers in Section 31.

(b) For the purpose of implementing a career ladder program for principals, any person employed and certified as a principal on the effective date of this Act who has been employed as a principal for at least eight (8) years and who meets the criteria established by the State Certification Commission shall be eligible to apply for a senior principal or distinguished senior principal certificate. Any person employed and certified as a principal on the effective date of this Act who has been employed as a principal for at least three (3) years and who meets the criteria established by the State Certification Commission shall be eligible to apply for a senior principal certificate.

(c) For the purpose of implementing a career ladder program for assistant principals, any person employed and certified as an assistant principal on the effective date of this Act who has been employed as an assistant principal for at least eight (8) years and who meets the criteria established by the State Certification Commission shall be eligible to apply for a senior assistant principal or distinguished senior assistant principal certificate. Any person employed and certified as a principal for at least three (3) years and who meets the criteria established by the State Certification Commission shall be eligible to apply for a senior assistant principal certificate.

(d) For the purpose of implementing a career ladder program for supervisors, any person employed and certified as a supervisor on the effective date of this Act who has been employed as a supervisor for at least eight (8) years and who meets the criteria established by the State Certification Commission shall be eligible to apply for a senior supervisor or distinguished senior supervisor certificate. Any person employed as a supervisor on the effective date of this Act who has been employed as a supervisor for at least three (3) years and who meets the criteria established by the State Certification Commission shall be eligible to apply for a senior supervisor certificate.

SECTION 7.

(a) Any person who was certified and employed full time prior to the effective date of this Act, as a teacher, principal or assistant principal, or supervisor, and who becomes certified and is employed as a career level teacher, principal or assistant principal, or supervisor, may, prior to the expiration of their first career level certificate issued by the State Certification Commission under this chapter, elect to renew the certificate previously issued by the State Board of Education.

(b) Any certified person may elect this option only one time and upon doing so, shall receive all future certificates from the State Certification Commission acting as the board of examiners of teachers under the provisions of Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 12.

(c) Any person who was certified and employed full time prior to the effective date of this Act, as a teacher, principal or assistant principal, or supervisor who applies for any career level certificate provided for in this chapter and who does not qualify for such certificate shall retain the certificate issued prior to the effective date of this Act for the remainder of the term of that certificate and may renew that certificate in accordance with standards issued by the State Certification Commission in accordance with Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1236.

(d) When determining whether any person applying for any certificate provided for in this Act meets a minimum qualification relating to prior years of experience, the applicant's total current, relevant years of experience shall be credited notwithstanding any breaks in employment. The State Certification Commission may, by rule, establish criteria by which the currency and relevancy of the prior experience may be determined.

SECTION 8. Persons applying for any certificate provided for in this Act shall apply to the State Certification Commission.

SECTION 9.

(a) Any person applying for a certificate provided for herein who is not certified by the State Certification Commission may request the State Board of Education to review the decision by filing a written request for review of the decision of a regional commission or the State Certification Commission within thirty (30) days following the date of the decision. This request shall contain a detailed statement of the basis of the request for review.

(b) The State Board of Education shall conduct this review based upon the record prepared by the regional commission or the State Certification Commission or both and shall have the authority, by rule, to prescribe the contents and form of this record. This record shall include any statements or written evidence which the person applying for the certificate desires to submit.

(c) Upon the receipt of the request for review of a decision and the record of the proceedings of either the regional commission or State Certification Commission, as applicable, the State Board of Education shall authorize a staff member to review the record and prepare proposed findings of fact and a recommended decision which shall be sent to the parties.

(d) Any person applying for the certification who does not agree with this proposed decision in his case may, within ten (10) days of his receipt of the decision, file written exceptions to the decision stating in detail his reasons for taking exception to the proposed decision and may request a hearing before a duly authorized hearing officer of the State Board of Education. If a hearing is requested, it shall be limited to the record below; provided, however, that the person filing the exception shall be entitled to introduce new evidence relating to the bias or prejudice of either the regional commission or the State Certification Commission or, with the approval of the hearing officer, any other additional evidence when it has been shown to the satisfaction of the hearing officer that the additional evidence is material and that there were good reasons for failure to present it in the proceedings before the regional commission or the State Certification Commission.

(e) Any person applying for a certificate provided for in this Act who is aggrieved by the decision of the State Board of Education is entitled to judicial review in the manner provided for in Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 4-5-322.

(f) No person seeking to review a decision of a regional commission, the State Certification Commission or the State Board of Education shall be entitled to be paid the salary supplement for the certificate in dispute but shall be entitled to receive the salary supplement for any current, valid certificate held by such person.

(g) The State Board of Education may, in its discretion, direct the State Certification Commission to extend the validity of a certificate provided for in this Act, for a period not to exceed one (1) year, for any person requesting a review of a decision of a regional board or the State Certification Commission. Provided, however, that any person whose certificate is extended after it otherwise expires shall not be entitled to the salary supplement provided for in this Act and shall not be required to perform the additional duties, if any, required in this Act.

(h) The State Board of Education shall construe the provisions of this Act, and the rules, regulations, and evaluation criteria promulgated pursuant thereto, in favor of the person seeking review, absent substantial and material evidence to the contrary. However, the burden of going forward with the evidence shall be upon the person seeking to review the decision of a regional commission or the State Certification Commission.

SECTION 10. Once a person qualifies for and receives a salary supplement as a professional, senior or distinguished senior teacher or a senior or distinguished senior assistant principal, principal or supervisor, such person shall not be denied the supplement unless

- (1) he is dismissed for cause;
- (2) he fails to maintain or renew any certificate provided for in this Act; or
- (3) elects not to or refuses to perform the extra duties required in this Act.

SECTION 11.

(a) Costs of administration of this Act, including the salary supplements, pay for substitutes, travel expenses of the members of the Regional Commissions or the State Certification Commission, and other expenses incident to the Act, shall not be a part of or paid through the Tennessee Education Finance Act of 1977 (Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 6).

(b) Funds paid out by the state under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to the provisions of Section 8-11-110, and shall not be subject to any reduction on account of that section or otherwise.

SECTION 12. Not less than every four (4) years, the General Assembly shall review the amount of the supplements provided for herein in relation to the cost of living increases which have occurred during the years following the time the supplements were last reviewed or set.

SECTION 13.

(a) There is hereby created a special joint committee of the General Assembly composed of three (3) members of the Education Committee of the Senate and three (3) members of the Finance, Ways and Means Committee of the Senate appointed by the Speaker of the Senate and three (3) members of the Education Committee of the House of Representatives and three (3) members of the Finance, Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House. This committee shall examine the fiscal posture of the teacher compensation program based on the number of teachers eligible for supplements, and shall issue an annual report to the Governor and to the General Assembly for such time as the General Assembly considers appropriate. The Commissioner of Education, the Department of Education and the State Certification Commission shall provide the committee with whatever information relating to the implementation of this Act that the committee may from time to time require.

(b) If, after the fourth year of implementation, the number of senior or distinguished senior teachers, principals or supervisors rises by more than five percent (5%) in any twelve (12) month period, the State Certification Commission shall notify the General Assembly. The General Assembly thereupon shall take such action as is necessary to protect the fiscal integrity of the career ladder program.

(c) It is the intent of the General Assembly that the salary supplements provided for herein be awarded on the basis of outstanding performance and that the standards utilized for this purpose be kept high. The Commissioner of Education shall report to the committee on the adequacy of the standards.

SECTION 14. There is hereby created the State Certification Commission, which is responsible for the certification of all educators provided for in this Act.

SECTION 15. The State Certification Commission shall consist of thirteen (13) persons appointed by the Governor, as follows: four (4) distinguished senior teachers, one (1) from each grand division and one (1) at large, and at least one (1) being an elementary school teacher, one (1) a middle school teacher, and one (1) a high school teacher; two (2) distinguished senior principals, at large; one (1) distinguished senior supervisor, at large; two (2) distinguished representatives of higher education, one (1) from a public and one (1) from a non-public institution approved for teacher training in Tennessee by the State Board of Education; three (3) distinguished lay persons, one (1) from each grand division; and the Commissioner of Education. Except for the Commissioner of Education, the appointed members shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate and the House of Representatives. Members shall be eligible for reappointment and shall serve until their successors are appointed and qualified. If a vacancy occurs or if an appointment is required at such time the General Assembly is recessed or adjourned, the Governor may make an interim appointment which shall be

subject to confirmation when the General Assembly next convenes. The members shall annually elect one of their number to serve as chairman. In making his initial appointments, the Governor shall appoint one (1) distinguished senior teacher and one (1) lay person to a term of one (1) year; one (1) lay person, and one (1) higher education representative for a term of two (2) years; and all other appointments for three (3) years. Thereafter, all terms shall be for three (3) years.

SECTION 16. The State Certification Commission shall have the following duties:

(1) To receive from each Regional Commission, recommendations for the certification of all apprentice and professional teachers and provisional principals and supervisors under the provisions of this chapter.

(2) To review and act upon all applications for senior and distinguished senior teachers, principals and supervisors.

(3) To receive, from local boards of education, recommendations for certification of probationary teachers.

(4) To promulgate, with the approval of the State Board of Education and in consultation with the Advisory Commission on Teacher Education and Certification, certification standards and criteria including education and competency requirements. Upon approving the standards and criteria prepared by the State Certification Commission, the State Board of Education shall file the standards and criteria with the Office of the Secretary of State. Copies of these standards and criteria shall also be filed with the education committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(5) To study the use of student progress or achievement, as measured by standardized testing or other appropriate measures, as an indicator of successful teaching and effective schools, and to review periodically the standards and criteria used for teacher and

principal evaluation in view of the findings resulting from such study.

(6) To develop, approve, or acquire such tests and examinations as it deems necessary to further the certification process.

(7) To certify all educators under the provisions of this Act, including the granting of licenses to probationary teachers and certificates to apprentice teachers.

(8) To appoint panels to assist it in the performance of its duties.

SECTION 17.

(a) The State Certification Commission shall, by rules which it may promulgate or amend from time to time, regulate and provide operating policies and procedures which ensure fairness, quality, professionalism, and efficiency in the career ladder certification system, including uniformity among the regional commissions created in this Act.

(b) The State Certification Commission shall have all the power and authority over such certificates expressly including the power to promulgate rules governing the administration of this chapter and the issuance or reissuance of certificates for all persons desiring certification or recertification whether or not employed by a local board of education. Under such rules, the State Certification Commission may establish guidelines with regard to the frequency and number of times a person may make application for the various professional level teacher certificates, or the various principal or supervisor certificates. All rules and criteria adopted by the State Certification Commission shall be approved by the State Board of Education in accordance with Section 16 prior to their effectiveness.

SECTION 18. The State Certification Commission may assign applications to the regional commission of the grand division in which the person applying resides.

SECTION 19. The State Certification Commission shall serve without pay other than their usual compensation except that travel expenses will be reimbursed in accordance with the provisions of the comprehensive travel regulations as promulgated by the Department of Finance and Administration and approved by the Attorney General.

SECTION 20. In each grand division of the state there shall be a Regional Certification Commission.

SECTION 21. Each regional certification commission shall be composed of nine (9) persons to be appointed by the State Certification Commission in accordance with procedures the State Certification Commission shall adopt. These appointments shall be as follows: four (4) distinguished senior teachers employed within the grand division, one (1) of whom shall have major experience in grades kindergarten through four (4) of elementary school, one (1) in middle school, one (1) in senior high school, and one (1) at large; two (2) distinguished senior principals employed within the grand division, one (1) of whom shall have major experience in elementary school, and one (1) in high school; one (1) distinguished senior supervisor employed within the grand division; one (1) member of the teacher education department of a higher education institution in the region approved for teacher training; and one (1) lay person. The appointed members shall serve until their successors are chosen and qualified and may succeed themselves. In making the initial appointment to each regional commission, the State Certification Commission shall appoint two (2) distinguished senior teachers and one (1) distinguished senior principal to a term of three (3) years; one (1) distinguished senior teacher, one (1) distinguished senior principal and one (1) distinguished senior supervisor to a term of two (2) years; and one distinguished senior teacher, one (1) lay person and one (1) member of the teacher education

department of a higher education institution in the region approved for teacher training to a term of one (1) year. Thereafter, all terms shall be for three (3) years.

SECTION 22. The regional commissions shall have the following duties:

(1) To review and act upon all applications for certification for apprentice or professional teachers and provisional supervisors and principals.

(2) To assign evaluation teams from among distinguished senior teachers, or distinguished senior principals or supervisors as applicable or professional qualified evaluators to conduct the evaluations and make recommendations to the regional commissions.

(3) To make recommendations to the State Certification Commission concerning certification for apprentice and professional teachers and provisional principals and supervisors.

SECTION 23. The regional commission members shall serve without pay, other than their usual compensation as public employees, but will be reimbursed for their expenses while on regional commission duty in accordance with the provisions of the comprehensive travel regulations as promulgated by the Department of Finance and Administration and approved by the Attorney General.

SECTION 24. The Department of Education shall reimburse local education agencies an amount not to exceed thirty dollars (\$30) per day for any necessary substitute while a career level teacher, principal, or supervisor or a Regional Commission or a State Certification Commission member is performing duties under this chapter.

SECTION 25.

(a) After the effective date of this Act, all certificates for teachers, principals, or supervisor, and renewals thereof shall be issued by the State Certification Commission in accordance with the terms of this chapter.

(b) After the effective date of this Act, the State Certification Commission shall assume the duties of the Board of Education under Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 12, as the board of examiners of teachers.

(c) All certificates of educators who are not included in the professional career ladder program provided for in this Act, in effect on the effective date of this Act, under the provisions of Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 12, shall remain in full force and effect according to their terms and may be renewed, as provided by subsection (b) and in accordance with the regulations of the State Board of Education.

SECTION 26.

(a) The State Certification Commission shall issue four (4) levels of teaching certificates: apprentice, professional, senior and distinguished senior. Teachers possessing a current, valid certificate on the effective date of this Act shall be eligible to apply for career level certificates based on experience as set out in Section 6 of this Act. Teachers who are employed initially after the effective date of this Act shall be eligible to apply for career level certificates based on experience, as follows:

(1) Professional -- Employment for three (3) years as an apprentice teacher.

(2) Senior -- Employment for at least five (5) years as a professional teacher.

(3) Distinguished Senior -- Employment for at least five (5) years as a senior teacher.

SECTION 27.

(a) All teachers certified after the effective date of this Act and all current teachers who choose to participate in the career teacher program, shall be evaluated according to the process adopted by the State Certification Commission.

(b)' Advancement from one career level to another shall be awarded by the State Certification Commission as provided for in this chapter.

(c) These evaluations shall be part of a teacher's permanent record.

SECTION 28.

(a) The initial certificate for professional, senior and distinguished senior teachers shall be valid for five (5) years and shall be renewable for additional periods of five (5) years. The license for a probationary teacher shall be for one (1) year and shall not be renewable. The license for the apprentice teacher shall be valid for three (3) years and shall not be renewable.

(b) In addition to the other requirements provided for herein, during each renewal cycle, a teacher shall complete two (2) academic courses as part of the certification renewal process. Credit shall be granted only for upper division level courses in the respective area of certification which are completed with a composite 2.5 grade point average (on a four (4) point grading system). A teacher may complete upper division courses in another subject if they are taken with the goal of broadening the areas of certification. When necessary, a local education agency shall adjust the work schedule of a senior teacher or distinguished senior teacher employed under an eleven (11) or twelve (12) month contract to enable the teacher to complete the upper division courses required by this section.

(c) (1) In the case of a professional teacher who has been evaluated and found not to meet the minimum competency standards of the State Certification Commission, the State Certification Commission shall send a written notice of its findings to the teacher, the local education agency employing the teacher and the Commissioner of Education.

(2) Upon receipt of this notice from the State Certification Commission, the Commissioner of Education shall

notify the local education agency employing the teacher that the state minimum foundation funds allocated to that teacher will be withheld and discontinued beginning the first day of the next school year following the month in which the State Certification Commission's decision was made, for so long as the teacher remains employed by the local education agency.

(3) A local education agency may, together with a teacher found not to meet minimum competency standards, appeal the withholding of funds under this subdivision. Such appeal shall be made in accordance with the provisions of Section 9 of this Act. If the local education agency files an appeal from the notice that state funds will be discontinued as provided for herein, the funds shall not be withheld pending the final determination of the appeal by the State Board of Education. If the State Board of Education finally upholds the determination of the State Certification Commission and decides that the teacher did not meet minimum competency standards, the minimum foundation funds, in an amount relating back to the date upon which the State Certification Commission's determination was originally made shall be withheld from current or future payments by the State to that school district.

(4) The funds withheld in accordance with this subdivision shall be restored to the local education agency if satisfactory proof that the teacher is no longer employed by the local education agency is presented to the Commissioner of Education.

(5) Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to prevent a local education agency from continuing to employ a teacher found not to meet the minimum competency standards of the State Certification Commission; provided that the state

shall, in no form, be responsible for paying any portion of such teacher's salary and benefits.

(d) Any teacher holding a senior teacher certificate whose certificate is not renewed in due course because of the teacher's failure to meet the relevant certification standards shall, at the expiration of the senior teacher's certificate and if minimum competency standards are met, be issued a professional teacher certificate that shall be valid for five (5) years and shall be subject to renewal in the same manner as other professional teacher certificates.

(e) Any teacher holding a distinguished senior teacher certificate whose certificate is not renewed in due course because of the teacher's failure to meet the relevant certification standards shall, at the expiration of such certificate and if minimum competency standards are met, be issued a senior teacher certificate that shall be valid for five (5) years and shall be subject to renewal in the same manner as other such certificates.

(f) Any career level certificate may be extended by the State Certification Commission for a period of time not to exceed one (1) year if a person's illness, disability or family hardship prevents the completion of the evaluation for the purpose of recertification.

SECTION 29. The criteria for the evaluation of teachers which are to be used by the regional commissions and the State Certification Commission shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (1) classroom or position observation and assessment by a team of properly trained distinguished senior teachers or distinguished senior principals or supervisors in grades K through 12 from outside the applicant's school system; or professionally qualified evaluators; (2) review of evaluations by principals, supervisors and others in authority; (3) personal interview; (4) examination of inservice and professional development activities undertaken by the applicant; and (5) other appropriate criteria.

SECTION 30.

(a) The procedural rules for the evaluation of teachers which are to be used by the local education agencies, regional commissions and the State Certification Commission shall be designed to assure a fair and meaningful evaluation of a teacher's development, growth and performance in the teaching profession. These rules shall be developed in consultation with local school administrators, and teachers, and the education committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(b) The procedural rules shall include:

(1) A pre-evaluation interview which includes the identification of performance goals for the teacher, based on the actual subjects to be taught and specific performance criteria as defined in Section 29; such pre-evaluation interview shall be conducted prior to each evaluation required by this section;

(2) Multiple observations in a variety of teaching or supervisory situations;

(3) Review of indicators of student progress, where applicable;

(4) A formal written evaluation which includes the subjects taught and the performance criteria;

(5) A post-evaluation interview in which the specific results of the evaluation are discussed with the teacher, and a written program of assistance for improvement, if needed, is established; and

(6) An opportunity for the teacher to respond, in writing, to the written evaluation with the response to be attached to the evaluation.

(c) The procedural rules shall include the opportunity for multiple evaluations of apprentice teachers. The performance of all apprentice teachers shall be evaluated at least once a year by a

regional commission and at more frequent intervals by the local education agency using procedures and evaluation criteria promulgated by the State Certification Commission and approved by the State Board of Education.

(d) The procedural rules shall include the opportunity for multiple evaluations of all teachers holding certificates other than an apprentice teacher's certificate. The performance of all teachers other than apprentice teachers shall be evaluated by the appropriate commission at least two (2) times between the time their certificate is issued or renewed and the certificate's expiration date and may be evaluated at more frequent intervals by the local education agency using procedures and evaluation criteria promulgated by the State Certification Commission. The scheduling of such evaluations by the State Certification Commission or a regional certification commission shall be determined in consultation with the local board of education.

(e) Nothing in the evaluation procedure mandated by this section shall require a decision by a local education agency to grant tenure or continued employment from year to year during the one (1) year probationary teacher period or the three (3) year apprentice teacher period.

(f) Evaluations conducted pursuant to this section shall be open for inspection by the teacher, principal, or local education agency or their designated representatives.

(g) At least one (1) evaluating teacher shall be from the general grade area or subject area as the teacher being evaluated.

(h) Upon being informed of the composition of the evaluating team, the teacher being evaluated may request that up to one member of the team be removed and that the Commission name a new member.

SECTION 31.

(a) Any duly certified professional teacher shall be employed for ten (10) months. A professional teacher shall perform those

duties prescribed by the local education agency and such additional duties as may be provided for in Section 34.

(b) Beginning in the 1984-1985 school year for teachers then certified, a duly certified professional teacher who has met the standards for certification established by the State Certification Commission and who is employed as such by a local education agency shall receive a one thousand dollar (\$1,000) salary supplement in addition to any other compensation to which the teacher may be entitled. To receive the supplement for the 1984-1985 school year, the professional teacher must receive a passing score on the most current edition of the National Teacher Examination Commons or Specialty Area Test by December 31, 1984 or other secure, basic professional skills test selected by the State Certification Commission and such other requirements as the State Certification Commission may establish for this purpose. For school years beginning after the 1984-1985 school year, the State Certification Commission shall establish the deadline by which these tests must be taken and passed.

SECTION 32.

(a) Any duly certified senior teacher paid as such shall be employed for not less than ten (10) nor more than eleven (11) months and shall perform additional duties prescribed by the local education agency from a list of activities approved by the commissioner of education. Upon receiving a senior teacher certificate, a teacher shall choose either a ten (10) month or an eleven (11) month contract consistent with the workplan developed by the local education agency in the manner provided for in Section 34. A teacher may choose to change the term of a contract from year to year consistent with the needs of the system.

(b) (1) Duly certified senior teachers who are employed as such by a local education agency under a ten (10) month contract shall receive a two thousand dollar (\$2,000) salary

supplement in addition to any other compensation to which the teacher may be entitled.

(2) Duly certified senior teachers who are employed as such by a local education agency under an eleven (11) month contract shall receive a four thousand dollar (\$4,000) salary supplement in addition to any other compensation to which the teacher may be entitled.

SECTION 33.

(a) Any duly certified distinguished senior teacher, paid as such, shall be employed for not less than ten (10) nor more than twelve (12) months and perform additional duties prescribed by the local education agency from a list of activities approved by the commissioner of education.

Upon receiving a distinguished senior teacher certificate, a teacher shall choose a ten (10), eleven (11), or twelve (12) month contract, consistent with the workplan developed by the local education agency in the manner provided for in Section 34. A teacher may choose to change the term of a contract from year to year consistent with the needs of the system.

(b) A distinguished senior teacher shall not be required to spend more than ten (10) days during the regular academic year in performing services for the State Certification Commission or a regional commission. In order not to disrupt student instruction, if the State Certification Commission wishes to use the services of a distinguished senior teacher to perform evaluations for more than a total of ten (10) days during a regular academic year, the State Certification Commission shall receive permission from the local education agency to do so and if denied, the teacher shall be placed on sabbaticals at state expense. Provided, however, that this provision shall not apply to teachers who are serving on the State Certification Commission or a regional certification commission.

(c) (1) Duly certified distinguished senior teachers who are employed as such by a local education agency under a ten (10) month contract shall receive a three thousand dollar (\$3,000) salary supplement in addition to any other compensation to which the teacher may be entitled.

(2) Duly certified distinguished senior teachers who are employed as such by a local education agency under an eleven (11) month contract shall receive a five thousand dollar (\$5,000) salary supplement in addition to any other compensation to which the teacher may be entitled.

(3) Duly certified distinguished senior teachers who are employed as such by a local board of education under a twelve (12) month contract shall receive a seven thousand dollar (\$7,000) salary supplement in addition to any other compensation to which the teacher may be entitled.

SECTION 34.

(a) (1) A professional teacher would be eligible for assignment by the principal to supervise and assist student interns and probationary teachers as an additional responsibility.

(2) A senior teacher shall be subject to assignment by the system superintendent to work with gifted or remedial students or in other student enrichment programs as an additional responsibility in accordance with the plan required in subsection (b). Such teacher may also at the discretion and direction of the principal, supervise and participate in the skills development of apprentice teachers.

(3) A distinguished senior teacher, at the direction of the principal, shall, as an additional responsibility, supervise and assist in the skills development of apprentice and professional teachers. Teachers with eleven (11) or twelve (12) month contracts shall be assigned, as an additional

responsibility, to work with remedial or gifted students according to the plan required in subsection (b), or in other student enrichment programs designed by the local board of education. .

(b) (1) Each local superintendent shall devise a plan to receive the maximum benefit from the additional responsibilities required of career level teachers. Such plans shall include, but not be limited to, enrichment programs for gifted students; remedial work with students according to their needs; enrichment programs in academic projects for all students, based on local needs and interests; skills development of probationary, apprentice, and professional teachers; and other programs, classes, or activities as will best utilize the particular talents of the senior and distinguished senior teachers and meet the academic and instructional needs of the local system.

(2) The plan shall also include the time periods in which the programs and activities shall occur. If at all possible, each system shall include a summer program in order to fully employ those teachers on eleven (11) and twelve (12) month contracts. Only if a superintendent and local board of education certify that it would not be feasible to finance the costs of required attendance by students in the summer months, may a plan be devised to utilize extra time each day, or during weekends or holidays to offer such programs, instead of summer sessions. A plan may, however, include enrichment or other programs at any time.

(3) The local superintendent shall submit the plan to the local board of education, and the local board, upon approval shall submit the plan to the department of education. The plan shall be reviewed by the department and accepted or rejected on its merits.

(c) If a local education agency finds that it cannot offer a summer program, and if its plan for additional activities during the regular school year is accepted, senior and distinguished senior teachers on eleven (11) and twelve (12) month contracts shall not be required to perform remedial or enrichment work during the summer months if the State Certification Commission is satisfied that the work performed by the teacher otherwise is sufficient to satisfy the additional responsibilities under this Act. If the Commission determines that such plan is inadequate for this purpose, the local superintendent and local board of education shall devise a plan to employ senior and distinguished senior teachers during the summer in curriculum and staff improvement activities.

SECTION 35.

(a) Any person who has been duly certified as a career level teacher shall have the right to be employed by any local education agency. Any local education agency, upon the superintendent's recommendation, shall have the authority to employ a career level teacher from within or from outside the system. This authority is not subject to limitation by whatever means.

(b) A person certified as a senior or distinguished senior teacher may enter into an employment agreement with a local education agency to be employed as a senior or distinguished senior teacher for a term not to exceed the time within which such certificate is valid.

SECTION 36. Any senior or distinguished senior teacher who declines the duties thereof shall not receive the state salary supplement authorized in this chapter.

SECTION 37.

(a) All supplements due to teachers under the provisions of this Act shall be paid directly by the department of education to the local education agency and shall be in addition to its foundation entitlement program, and not a part thereof.

(b) Once determined, the state salary supplement for career level teachers shall remain constant notwithstanding any increased training and experience attained, except the salary supplements for senior and distinguished senior teachers may be increased, as applicable, if the teacher chooses an eleven (11) or twelve (12) month contract.

(c) All supplements shall be subject to the availability of funds as appropriated in each year's appropriation act.

(d) Any person receiving a salary supplement under this Act shall continue to receive the state base pay to which he would be entitled if he were not receiving a salary supplement provided for herein. In devising its local salary schedule, a local education agency may not reduce or freeze the pay of any person receiving a salary supplement under this Act, but such person shall receive any local pay to which teachers with similar training and experience are otherwise entitled.

(e) If the usual term of a teacher's employment extends to eleven (11) or twelve (12) months, and the state and local base pay of such teacher is paid for each of these months, the teacher shall be eligible only for that portion of the supplement provided for in this Act which represents a reward for outstanding performance, and not that portion which represents compensation for the eleventh (11th) or twelfth (12th) month of service which the teacher would not otherwise perform.

SECTION 38.

(a) Any person who meets the minimum qualifications to be a probationary teacher as established by the State Certification Commission shall receive a license which shall be valid for one (1) year and which cannot be renewed.

(b) Any person obtaining a license as a probationary teacher shall have the right to be employed by any local education agency.

SECTION 39.

(a) Any person who meets the minimum qualifications to be an apprentice teacher as established by the State Certification Commission shall receive a certificate which shall be valid for three (3) years and which cannot be renewed.

(b) Any person obtaining a certificate as an apprentice teacher shall have the right to be employed by any local education agency.

SECTION 40.

(a) The State Certification Commission shall issue three (3) levels of principal certificates: provisional, senior, and distinguished senior.

(b) (1) Principals employed on the effective date of this Act shall be eligible to apply for career level certificates based on experience set out in Section 6 of this Act.

(2) Principals employed after the effective date of this Act shall be eligible to apply for career level certificates based on the following:

(A) Provisional -- Completion of requirements defined by the state board of education.

(B) Senior -- Employment for at least one (1) year as a provisional principal.

(C) Distinguished Senior -- Employment as a senior principal for at least five (5) years.

SECTION 41.

(a) All principals certified after the effective date of this Act and all current principals who choose to participate in the career principal program, shall be evaluated according to the process adopted by the State Certification Commission.

(b) Advancement from one career level to another shall be awarded by the State Certification Commission after a positive evaluation. The evaluations shall be designed to measure the administrative competencies, including instructional leadership, as

defined by the State Certification Commission. Evaluations for advancement on the career ladder shall be conducted by properly trained principals and educators selected from school systems other than the system in which the evaluated principal is employed. At least one evaluating principal shall be from the same grade area as the principal being evaluated.

(c) These evaluations shall be part of a principal's permanent record.

SECTION 42.

(a) The initial certificate at each level shall be valid for five (5) years and, except for the provisional certificate which is valid for three (3) years and which is not renewable, shall be renewable for additional periods of five (5) years.

(b) Any career level certificate may be extended by the State Certification Commission for a period of time not to exceed one (1) year if a person's illness, disability or family hardship prevents the completion of the evaluation for the purpose of recertification.

(c) If a senior principal applies for a distinguished senior certificate and is unsuccessful, the senior certificate may be renewed if the principal meets the qualifications for a senior certificate.

(d) If a distinguished senior principal is denied recertification as a distinguished senior principal, he shall be eligible, upon meeting minimum competency standards, to be certified as a senior principal.

SECTION 43.

(a) A provisional principal may be employed as such by a local school board for up to three (3) years.

(b) A provisional principal shall perform the duties defined by the local board of education as provided in Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-254, or other duties of principals defined elsewhere in Title 49.

SECTION 44.

(a) A senior principal shall work at least an eleven (11) month contract.

(b) A senior principal shall perform the duties defined by the local board of education, as provided in Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-254, or other duties of principals defined elsewhere in Title 49.

(c) A senior principal employed as such by a local education agency shall receive a four thousand dollar (\$4,000) salary supplement from the state in addition to all other compensation to which the principal may be entitled.

SECTION 45.

(a) A distinguished senior principal shall be employed on a twelve (12) month contract.

(b) A distinguished senior principal shall perform the duties defined by the local board of education, as provided in Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-254, and other duties of principals contained elsewhere in Title 49. In addition, a distinguished senior principal shall participate not more than ten (10) days each year in the evaluation of other candidates for career level positions. If it should prove necessary for principals to participate more than ten (10) days in evaluation, such principals shall be awarded sabbaticals in the manner provided for in Section 33 (b).

(c) A distinguished senior principal employed as such by a local education agency shall receive a seven thousand dollar (\$7,000) salary supplement from the state in addition to all other compensation to which the principal may be entitled.

SECTION 46.

(a) The State Certification Commission shall issue three (3) levels of assistant principal certificates: provisional, senior, and distinguished senior.

(b) (1) Assistant principals employed on the effective date of this Act shall be eligible to apply for career level certificates based on experience set out in Section 6 of this Act.

(2) Assistant principals employed after the effective date of this Act shall be eligible to apply for career level certificates based on the following:

(A) Provisional -- Completion of requirements defined by the state board of education.

(B) Senior -- Employment for at least one (1) year as a provisional assistant principal.

(C) Distinguished Senior -- Employment as a senior assistant principal for at least five (5) years.

SECTION 47.

(a) All assistant principals certified after the effective date of this Act and all current assistant principals who choose to participate in the career principal program, shall be evaluated according to the process adopted by the State Certification Commission.

(b) Advancement from one career level to another shall be awarded by the State Certification Commission after a positive evaluation. The evaluations shall be designed to measure the administrative competencies, including instructional leadership, as defined by the State Certification Commission. Evaluations for advancement on the career ladder shall be conducted by properly trained principals, assistant principals and educators selected from school systems other than the system in which the evaluated assistant principal is employed. At least one evaluating assistant principal shall be from the same grade area as the assistant principal being evaluated.

(c) These evaluations shall be part of an assistant principal's permanent record.

SECTION 48.

(a) The initial certificate at each level shall be valid for five (5) years and, except for the provisional certificate which is valid for three (3) years and which is not renewable, shall be renewable for additional periods of five (5) years.

(b) Any career level certificate may be extended by the State Certification Commission for a period of time not to exceed one (1) year if a person's illness, disability or family hardship prevents the completion of the evaluation for the purpose of recertification.

(c) If a senior assistant principal applies for a distinguished senior certificate and is unsuccessful, the senior certificate may be renewed if the assistant principal meets the qualifications for a senior certificate.

(d) If a distinguished senior assistant principal is denied recertification as a distinguished senior assistant principal, he shall be eligible, upon meeting minimum competency standards, to be certified as a senior assistant principal.

SECTION 49.

(a) A provisional assistant principal may be employed as such by a local school board for up to three (3) years.

(b) Each local board of education shall define the job description of all persons employed as provisional assistant principals. If the responsibilities required by the local board do not address the competencies established by the State Certification Commission, the provisional assistant principal may, at the request of the local board and with the concurrence of the State Certification Commission, be exempted from participation in the career ladder program.

SECTION 50.

(a) A senior assistant principal shall work at least an eleven (11) month contract.

(b) Each local board of education shall define the job description of all persons employed as senior assistant principals. If the responsibilities required by the local board do not address the competencies established by the State Certification Commission, the senior assistant principal may, at the request of the local board and with the concurrence of the State Certification Commission, be exempted from participation in the career ladder program.

(c) A senior assistant principal employed as such by a local education agency shall receive a four thousand dollar (\$4,000) salary supplement from the state in addition to all other compensation to which the principal may be entitled.

SECTION 51.

(a) A distinguished senior assistant principal shall be employed on a twelve (12) month contract.

(b) Each local board of education shall define the job description of all persons employed as distinguished senior assistant principals. If the responsibilities required by the local board do not address the competencies established by the State Certification Commission, the assistant principal may, at the request of the local board and with the concurrence of the State Certification Commission, be exempted from participation in the career ladder program. In addition, a distinguished senior assistant principal shall participate not more than ten (10) days each year in the evaluation of candidates for career level positions. If it should prove necessary for assistant principals to participate more than ten (10) days in evaluation, such assistant principals shall be awarded sabbaticals in the manner provided for in Section 33 (b).

(c) A distinguished senior assistant principal employed as such by a local education agency shall receive a seven thousand

dollar (\$7,000) salary supplement from the state in addition to all other compensation to which the principal may be entitled.

SECTION 52.

(a) Any person who has been duly certified as a senior or distinguished senior principal shall have the right to be employed by any local education agency. Any local education agency, upon the superintendent's recommendation, shall have the authority to employ a senior or distinguished senior principal from within or from outside the system. This authority is not subject to limitation by whatever means.

(b) A person certified as a distinguished senior principal may enter into an employment agreement with a local education agency for a term not to exceed five (5) years.

SECTION 53.

(a) All supplements due to principals under the provisions of this Act shall be paid directly by the department of education to the local education agency and shall be in addition to its foundation entitlement program, and not a part thereof.

(b) Once determined, the state salary supplement for career level principals or assistant principals shall remain constant notwithstanding any increased training and experience attained.

(c) All supplements shall be subject to the availability of funds as appropriated in each year's appropriation act.

(d) Any person receiving a salary supplement under this Act shall continue to receive the state base pay to which he would be entitled if he were not receiving a salary supplement provided for herein. In devising its local salary schedule, a local education agency may not reduce or freeze the pay of any person receiving a salary supplement under this Act, but such person shall receive any local pay to which principals with similar training and experience are otherwise entitled.

(e) If the usual term of a principal's employment extends to eleven (11) or twelve (12) months, and the state and local base pay of such principal is paid for each of these months, the principal shall be eligible only for that portion of the supplement provided for in this Act which represents a reward for outstanding performance, and not that portion which represents compensation for the eleventh (11th) or twelfth (12th) month of service which the principal would not otherwise perform.

(f) A career level principal or assistant principal, if eligible, shall receive the state supplement to which he is otherwise entitled during the term of his current certificate even though the school at which he serves is closed or merged, so long as he remains employed in a public school system.

SECTION 54.

(a) The State Certification Commission shall issue three (3) levels of supervisor certificates: provisional, senior and distinguished senior.

(b) (1) Supervisors employed on the effective date of this Act shall be eligible to apply for career level certificates based on experience set out in Section 6 of this Act.

(2) Supervisors employed after the effective date of this Act shall be eligible to apply for career level certificates based on the following:

(A) Provisional -- Completion of requirements defined by the state board of education, and at least eight (8) years of service as a certified elementary or secondary school teacher.

(B) Senior -- Employment for at least three (3) years as a provisional supervisor.

(C) Distinguished Senior -- Employment as a senior supervisor for at least five (5) years.

(c) The career ladder program shall be open to all persons who come within a well-defined job description for supervisors devised by the State Board of Education prior to the effective date of this Act. It is the intent of the legislature that only those supervisors involved in staff or curriculum development on a full-time basis be eligible for entry into the career ladder. This determination shall be made by the State Certification Commission.

SECTION 55.

(a) All supervisors certified after the effective date of this Act and all current supervisors who choose to participate in the career supervisor program, shall be evaluated according to the process adopted by the State Certification Commission.

(b) Advancement from one career level to another shall be awarded by the State Certification Commission after a positive evaluation. The evaluation shall be designed to measure the administrative competencies as defined by the State Certification Commission. Evaluations for advancement on the career ladder shall be conducted by properly trained supervisors and educators selected from school systems other than the system in which the evaluated supervisor is employed.

(c) The evaluations shall be part of a supervisor's permanent record.

SECTION 56.

(a) The initial certificate at each level shall be valid for five (5) years and, except for the provisional certificate which is valid for three (3) years and which is not renewable, shall be renewable for additional periods of five (5) years.

(b) Any supervisor holding a distinguished senior supervisor certificate whose certificate is not renewed in due course because of the supervisor's failure to meet the relevant certification standards shall, at the expiration of the distinguished senior certificate and if minimum competency standards are met, be issued a

senior supervisor certificate that shall be valid for five (5) years and shall be subject to renewal in the same manner as other senior supervisor certificates.

(c) If a senior supervisor applies for a distinguished senior certificate and is unsuccessful, the senior certificate may be renewed if the supervisor meets the qualifications for a senior certificate.

(d) Any career level certificate may be extended by the State Certification Commission for a period of time not to exceed one (1) year if a person's illness, disability or family hardship prevents the completion of the evaluation for the purpose of recertification.

SECTION 57.

(a) A provisional supervisor may be employed as such by a local school board for up to three (3) years.

(b) A provisional supervisor shall perform the duties as defined by the local school board and consistent with state policy.

SECTION 58.

(a) A senior supervisor may be employed on an eleven (11) month contract.

(b) A senior supervisor shall perform the duties defined by the local board of education and consistent with state policy. The State Certification Commission shall establish standards and expectations for purposes of the career ladder program.

(c) A senior supervisor employed as such by a local education agency on an eleven (11) month contract shall receive a four thousand dollar (\$4,000) salary supplement from the state in addition to all other compensation to which the supervisor may be entitled.

SECTION 59.

(a) A distinguished senior supervisor may be employed on a twelve (12) month contract.

(b) A distinguished senior supervisor shall perform the duties defined by the local board of education and consistent with state policy. A distinguished senior supervisor shall participate not more than ten (10) days each year in the evaluation of other candidates for career level positions. If it should prove necessary for supervisors to participate more than ten (10) days in evaluation, such supervisors shall be awarded sabbaticals in the manner provided for in Section 33 (b).

(c) A distinguished senior supervisor employed as such by a local education agency on a twelve (12) month contract shall receive a seven thousand dollar (\$7,000) salary supplement from the state in addition to all other compensation to which the supervisor may be entitled.

SECTION 60. Any person who has been duly certified as a senior or distinguished senior supervisor shall have the right to be employed by any local education agency. Any local education agency, upon the superintendent's recommendation, shall have the authority to employ a senior or distinguished senior supervisor from within or from outside the system. This authority is not subject to limitation by whatever means.

SECTION 61.

(a) All supplements due to supervisors under the provisions of this Act shall be paid directly by the department of education to the local education agency and shall be in addition to its foundation entitlement program, and not a part thereof.

(b) Once determined, the state salary supplement for career level supervisors shall remain constant notwithstanding any increased training and experience attained.

(c) All supplements shall be subject to the availability of funds as appropriated in each year's appropriation act.

(d) Any person receiving a salary supplement under this Act shall continue to receive the state base pay to which he would be entitled if he were not receiving a salary supplement provided for

herein. In devising its local salary schedule, a local education agency may not reduce or freeze the pay of any person receiving a salary supplement under this Act, but such person shall receive any local pay to which supervisors with similar training and experience are otherwise entitled.

(e) If the usual term of a supervisor's employment extends to eleven (11) or twelve (12) months, and the state and local base pay of such supervisor is paid for each of these months, the supervisor shall be eligible only for that portion of the supplement provided for in this Act which represents a reward for outstanding performance, and not that portion which represents compensation for the eleventh (11th) or twelfth (12th) month of service which the supervisor would not otherwise perform.

SECTION 62. All supervisors shall participate in planning and presentation of staff development activities during the in-service training period.

SECTION 63. The General Assembly recognizes the vital position occupied by institutions of higher education in the training of teachers and the improvement in the quality of the education profession. In acting to support these functions in public institutions of higher education, the General Assembly must maintain a proper balance between the academic freedom of higher education and the need to respond to the public's expectations of quality in the state's teacher training programs. The General Assembly, therefore, does not seek to impose restrictions on the philosophy or course selection of teacher training programs. The General Assembly does, however, reserve the authority to require of each teacher training institution reasonable admission and graduation standards for prospective teachers in accordance with the provisions of Sections 64 through 72 of this Act.

SECTION 64. All students wishing to enter teacher training programs at state institutions after the effective date of this Act shall be required to achieve a passing score on the California Achievement

Test, as defined at present by the State Board of Education and as administered by an independent testing service. Beginning with the 1985-1986 academic year, a candidate also shall achieve a passing score on a standardized written composition. No other test scores shall be used in lieu of these requirements for admission to teacher training programs.

SECTION 65. In order to assure the public that every teacher has been adequately trained, teaching certificates shall be issued only to those students who have been graduated from a Tennessee institution certified by the state department of education or from an out-of-state institution certified by the state in which it is located. If the state in which an institution is located does not certify its institutions, then the state department of education may do so consistent with standards applicable to Tennessee institutions.

SECTION 66. A student shall spend a significant portion of three (3) academic quarters involved in classroom observation and teaching. Such observation shall begin in the sophomore year (unless the student shall have transferred from a two (2) year institution with which the teacher training institution has a transfer agreement, but which two (2) year junior or community college has no programs of classroom observation or student teaching). Each student shall be assigned to a tenured teacher for guidance, evaluation and instruction.

SECTION 67. Beginning with students graduating in 1986, all students desiring certification must pass both a commons test that measures basic verbal and methods skills, and a standardized or criterion referenced test for the desired area of endorsement. These tests shall be developed or acquired by the department of education, validated, and administered by the department at each institution. These tests shall be in lieu of the test described in Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1236.

SECTION 68.

(a) Those students who achieve a passing score on the state teachers examination, required by Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 49-1205 and 49-1236 or by Section 67 of this Act, are eligible to be licensed by the State Certification Commission as probationary teachers and may apply for employment in the school system of their choice.

(b) Prior to the issuance of certification, however, each probationary teacher must teach for a normal school year under the supervision of two (2) tenured teachers assigned by the principal. If possible, at least one (1) of the two (2) tenured teachers shall teach in the probationary teacher's area of specialization. At the end of the school year the candidate's evaluations will be sent to the local board of education, which will submit to the State Certification Commission a recommendation for issuance or denial of certification.

(c) The State Certification Commission shall consider, but shall not be bound by, the recommendation of the local board of education. The State Certification Commission shall be notified by the superintendent of schools of any out-of-school business, blood, or marriage relationship between the probationary teacher and any employee of the local school system.

SECTION 69. Beginning in 1986, the State Board of Education shall review the scores on the state teachers examination from each public and private teacher training institution. Those institutions which had thirty percent (30%) or more of its students fail the examination in the previous year shall be informed and placed on temporary probation. Any institution which has thirty percent (30%) or more of its students fail in two (2) consecutive years shall have its state certification revoked by the State Board of Education. An institution may regain its certification when seventy percent (70%) of those students taking the examination in an academic year achieve a passing score.

SECTION 70. Course requirements for subject area endorsements which certified teachers wish to acquire shall be based upon the same requirements as the initial endorsements. At the discretion of the State Certification Commission, credit shall be allowed for appropriate course work taken for initial certification. The regulations promulgated by the State Board of Education shall be amended to address allowable credit as to course work previously taken as to content and currency. These course requirements shall be from upper division courses taken from either four (4) year institutions, or from two (2) year colleges which have transfer agreements with the teacher education programs of four (4) year institutions.

SECTION 71. Beginning in the 1986-1987 academic year, all courses taken toward meeting the requirement for a teacher endorsement shall be selected from those courses required for an academic major in the various fields of the arts and sciences. This requirement shall not apply to standard methods courses or other courses designed especially for training elementary teachers.

SECTION 72.

(a) All full-time college of education faculty members, including deans of such colleges, universities shall further their professional development through direct personal involvement in the public school setting of grades K-12 on a periodic basis.

(b) Such faculty involvement shall take the form of in-service training activities for public school teachers, observation and evaluation of student teachers, or classroom instruction in a public school.

(c) This program shall be developed for implementation in the 1985-1986 academic year by the State Board of Education, acting in concert with the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees, the State Board of Regents, and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. The Tennessee Council of Private Colleges and Universities shall be invited to participate.

(d) After initial implementation the State Board of Education, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the State Board of Regents, and the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees shall designate subcommittees to meet jointly at least annually for structured meetings to coordinate policy on matters of mutual interest. An appropriate representative body of the approved private colleges and universities training teachers in Tennessee shall be invited to participate.

SECTION 73. There is hereby created the Tennessee Principal-Administrator Academy under the auspices of the department of education. The Academy is not a single institution, but is an organizational framework for a wide array of educational and training programs for school leaders, conducted at several sites in the three (3) grand divisions of the State by the department of education.

SECTION 74. Training opportunities for principals and appropriate supervisory and administrative staff shall be made available, through the Academy, within the limits of the approved budget of the department of education. The purpose of the Academy is to instill and reinforce instructional leadership for educational effectiveness. The Academy will consist of but not be limited to seminars and symposia for provisional principals and supervisors, special topic workshops, skill-building programs, advanced leadership training, appropriate programs for central office personnel, and such other programs as may be devised by the department. The commissioner of education shall approve all training activities of the Academy, which will be provided by department staff, university-based experts, outstanding school practitioners, the professional associations, and such others as determined by the commissioner. The Academy will include summer institutes especially for school principals and administrators provided at several sites in the three (3) grand divisions.

SECTION 75.

(a) Each principal and administrator shall be required to attend the Principal-Administrator Academy for instruction at least once every five (5) years.

(b) In order to provide for orderly admission of principals and administrators, within the requirements of subsection (a), the commissioner of education shall establish admission procedures for the Academy.

SECTION 76. These institutes shall be provided without cost to those attending; however, participant travel, living and incidental costs shall be at the expense of the participant, or if the local education agency so determines, it may reimburse from school funds its participants for their reasonable expenses, not exceeding amounts authorized for state employees in the comprehensive travel regulations as promulgated by the Department of Finance and Administration and approved by the Attorney General.

SECTION 77. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-107, is amended by deleting the words and punctuation "and also the board of examiners of teachers,".

SECTION 78. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-108, is amended by inserting between the words "state board of education" and the words "to prescribe rules", the following:

to approve regulations, certification standards,
and evaluation criteria of the state
certification commission;

SECTION 79. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-224, is amended in item (13) by deleting the words "given by the state commissioner of education" and substituting instead the words "given by the state commissioner of education or the state certification commission".

SECTION 80. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-605, is amended by adding a new subsection thereto, as follows:

(j) Each LEA shall be entitled to one (1) state-funded teacher's aide for each three (3) full-time certified teachers

employed by that LEA in grades one (1) through three (3). In the 1984-1985 school year, a sufficient number of aide positions shall be funded to provide one (1) aide per three such teachers in grade one (1); in the 1985-1986 school year, a sufficient number for grades one (1) and two (2); and in the 1986-1987 school year, a sufficient number of positions funded to meet the full requirements of the first sentence of this subsection.

SECTION 81. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-607, is amended by adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

(c) Funds paid by the state as salary supplements under the career ladder program as set out in the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, shall not be included in the state contribution as provided for in this section, and such career ladder payments shall not be distributed in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, but only as set out in the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984.

SECTION 82. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1232, is amended by deleting the words "state board of education" in the second line and substituting the words "state certification commission".

SECTION 83. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1234, is amended by deleting the words "state board of education" wherever they appear in the first paragraph and substituting the words "state certification commission".

SECTION 84. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1235, is amended by deleting the section in its entirety and substituting the following:

(a) Complete jurisdiction over the issuance and administration of certificates for superintendents is vested in the State Board of Education.

(b) Complete jurisdiction over the issuance and administration of certificates, renewals of certificates, and endorsements for teachers, principals, and supervisors, who were certified before the

effective date of this Act is vested in the State Certification Commission which shall continue to issue and renew such certificates and endorsements agreeably to the provisions of this chapter and any regulations issued by the State Board of Education pursuant thereto.

(c) Complete jurisdiction over the issuance and administration of certificates and endorsements, including the evaluation of applicants therefore, for teachers, principals, and supervisors who elect to enter the career ladder program or who are employed after the effective date of this Act is vested in the State Certification Commission. Such issuance, administration, and evaluation shall be done agreeably to the provisions of this chapter and the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, but in the case of any conflict, the provisions of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 shall govern.

(d) Certificates shall be uniform for all the school systems in the state.

SECTION 85. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1236, is amended by deleting the first sentence and substituting the following:

The State Board of Education and the State Certification Commission are authorized, empowered, and directed to set up rules and regulations governing the issuance of certificates in their respective jurisdictions, as set out in Section 49-1235.

SECTION 86. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1237, is amended by deleting the section in its entirety.

SECTION 87. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1240, is amended by deleting the words "state board of education" in the fifth line of the section and substituting instead the words "state board of education and the state certification commission".

SECTION 88. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1241, is amended by deleting the words "state board of education" and substituting the words "state certification commission".

SECTION 89. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1301, is amended by deleting the words "the commissioner or state board of education," and substituting the words "the commissioner, state board of education, or state certification commission, as applicable and".

SECTION 90. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-1709, is amended by deleting the section in its entirety and substituting instead the following:

Section 49-1709. (a) Each public school system shall maintain a term of not less than two hundred (200) days, divided as follows:

(1) One hundred eighty (180) days for classroom instruction;

(2) Ten (10) days for vacation with pay;

(3) Five (5) days for in-service education;

(4) Five (5) days for administrative functions.

(b) Vacation days shall be in accordance with policies recommended by the local superintendent of schools and adopted by the local board of education.

(c) (1) In-service days shall be used according to a plan recommended by the local superintendent of schools in accordance with the provisions of this section and other applicable statutes, and adopted by the local board of education, a copy of which plan indicating all individuals or agencies contributing to the in-service training of school personnel shall be filed with the state commissioner of education on or before September 1 of the current school year and approved by him.

(2) The needs of probationary and apprentice teachers shall be given priority in the planning of in-service activities. Apprentice teachers shall be assisted by supervising teachers in the development of

competencies required by the State Certification Commission and the local board of education.

The plan shall also give priority to staff development activities. Staff development activities shall include an assessment of teacher and administrator evaluations made previously by the State Certification Commission and the local school system. Distinguished senior teachers and supervisors shall be assigned to aid those teachers seeking to improve teaching competencies.

(d) The State Board of Education shall develop a policy governing professional development activities during in-service education within the guidelines adopted by the General Assembly.

SECTION 91. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, Chapter 50, Part 1, is amended by adding thereto a new section as follows:

Section 49-50-125.

(a) In order to address the serious shortage of math and science teachers in Tennessee, the Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation shall administer a tuition loan program for students who pledge to teach math or science courses in Tennessee public schools for at least four (4) years. Such loans shall be available for attendance at any university in the state and may be for any amount up to the full cost of tuition at the applicable institution.

(b) These loans shall also be available to teachers certified at present who wish to obtain an endorsement to teach math or science.

(c) The State Board of Education is authorized to broaden or reduce the categories available for these loans in the event of teacher shortages in other areas, or to reduce the amount or number of loans available for mathematics or science.

(d) Tuition loans shall be forgivable on a year-by-year basis to afford a recipient the opportunity to "buy-out" of the forgiveness provision by paying off a prorated amount of the loan for the remainder of the four (4) year period which the recipient may elect not to teach in Tennessee public schools.

(e) The availability of loans shall be subject to the appropriation of funds in each year's appropriation act.

SECTION 92. The State Board of Education shall submit to the General Assembly by January 1, 1985 a recommendation of methods to reduce the number of waivers granted for out-of-field teaching.

SECTION 93. Within two (2) years after the effective date of this Act, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the State Certification Commission and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, shall cause a study or studies to be made of the following matters:

(1) the sufficiency of existing teacher training programs and components with a view toward successful integration of liberal arts courses, teaching level specialties and a professional curriculum;

(2) the preparation, training and experience of higher education faculty engaged in teacher training programs with a view toward determining appropriate criteria and personnel standards and the sufficiency of those standards; and

(3) the adoption of a student teaching practicum to offer direct, substantial, quality participation in teaching at the elementary and secondary teaching level over an extended period of time and under the supervision of college and elementary or secondary based personnel. When completed, these studies, and any appropriate recommendations shall be filed with the appropriate Senate and House standing committees.

SECTION 94. For the purpose of beginning the implementation of this Act, and pending the appointment and confirmation pursuant to Section 17 and the appointment of the regional certification commissions pursuant to Section 23, an interim certification commission is hereby

created. This commission shall consist of eighteen (18) persons appointed by the Governor. The commission shall fairly represent the public, teachers, the Tennessee Education Association, the Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents, the Tennessee School Boards Association, the Tennessee Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Elementary Principals' Study Council, the Secondary Principals' Association, the Tennessee Congress of Parents and Teachers and the Deans' Council for Teacher Education. If the persons representative of the groups set forth above are presently serving on the ad hoc interim commission and are willing to serve on the interim commission provided for herein, the Governor is urged to consider favorably the appointment of such persons in order to provide continuity and experienced members for the new interim commission. The Governor shall designate the chairman of the interim commission.

The members of the interim commission shall be subject to legislative confirmation in accordance with the provisions of Section 17 and shall be appointed and confirmed, to the extent practicable, prior to adjournment, sine die, of the Ninety-third General Assembly. The interim commission shall serve until the State Certification Commission and the regional certification commissions are appointed, confirmed and organized and shall be dissolved and cease to function at that time, but not later than July 1, 1985.

The interim commission shall have the power to perform all the duties of the State Certification Commission and the regional certification commissions provided for herein. To assist in the selection of sufficient numbers of distinguished senior teachers and distinguished senior principals and supervisors to establish the first State Certification Commission and regional certification commissions, the interim commission shall have the power and authority, through the department of education, to hire a sufficient number of qualified professional evaluators at State expense chosen from public or private university faculty or staff knowledgeable in evaluation, the state

department of education, educators employed by local education agencies or other persons having educator evaluation qualifications similar to those set forth herein. Before commencing their work, such educators shall receive training in educator evaluation in accordance with criteria adopted by the interim commission.

The members of the interim commission shall serve without pay except for the regular salaries to which they may be otherwise entitled but may be reimbursed for their expenses while performing their duties for the interim commission in accordance with the comprehensive travel regulations as promulgated by the Department of Finance and Administration and approved by the Attorney General. If the interim commission desires to employ an educator employed by a local education agency to assist in the performance of its duties, it shall, through the department of education, enter into an appropriate agreement with the educator and the local education agency in conformance with Sections 26 and 43 of this Act. Professional qualified evaluators employed by the department of education shall be reimbursed for their travel expenses while performing their duties in accordance with the comprehensive travel regulations as promulgated by the Department of Finance and Administration and approved by the Attorney General.

SECTION 95. In the case of a conflict between this Act and any other law, the provisions of this Act shall prevail.

SECTION 96. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the Act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to that end, the provisions of this Act are declared to be severable.

SECTION 97. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1984, except that for the purpose of rulemaking by the State Board of Education or the State Certification Commission, the Act shall take effect upon becoming a law, the public welfare requiring it.

APPENDIX G
MERIT PAY REFERENCES

Appendix G

Merit Pay References

- Barber, L.W. & Klein, K. (1983, December). Merit pay and teacher evaluation. Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 247-251.
- Bellon & Bellon. (1983, Fall). Merit pay and other incentive programs characteristics, considerations, and expectations. Tennessee Educational Leadership, 10(2), 65-75.
- Brinks, J. (1980, May). Is there merit in merit increases? Personal Administrator, 25(5).
- Burke, B.T. (1982, December). Merit pay for teachers: Round Valley may have the answer. Phi Delta Kappan.
- Doremus, R.R. (1982). What ever happened to Kalamazoo's merit pay plan? Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 409-410.
- Educational Research Service, Incorporated (1979). Merit pay for teachers. Arlington, VA: Author.
- English, F.W. (1983, December-1984, January). Merit pay: Reflections on education's lemon tree. Education Leadership.
- Frase, L.E., Hetzel, R. & Grant, R. (1982, December). Merit pay: A research-based alternative in Tucson. Phi Delta Kappan.
- Houston Independent School District. (1982). Two year impact study of second mile plan. Houston, TX: Author.
- Kohut, S. & Wright, J. (1984). Merit pay movement 1980's style. Educational Horizons, 62(2).
- League of Women Voters of Tennessee. (1983, September). Incentive pay plans and the evaluation of teachers: A background paper. Nashville, TN: Author.
- McKenna, C.D. (1973, February). Merit pay? Yes! National Elementary Principal.
- Merit pay for good teachers. (1983, June 20). U.S. News and World Report, 94(24), 61-62.
- Meyer, H.H. (1975). The pay-for-performance dilemma. Organizational Dynamics, 3.

- Miller, L. & Slay, E. (1982, September). This bold incentive pay plan pits capitalism against teacher shortages. American School Board Journal, 169(9), 24-25.
- New NEA head discusses union's views on pay plans. (1983, July 4). Education Week, 2(37), 6.
- Parish, J. (1983, June). Excellence in education: Tennessee's master teacher plan. Phi Delta Kappan, 64.
- Pate-Bain, H. (1983, June). A teacher's view on the Tennessee master teacher plan. Phi Delta Kappan.
- Scavizzo, R. (1983, July 4). Merit pay for teacher. Newsweek, 101(25), 5.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1975). Financial incentives and teacher accountability are we paying for the wrong thing? Educational Administration Quarterly, 11.
- Stedman, C.H. (1983, March-April). Tennessee's master plans for teachers, supervisors, and principals. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(2), 55-58.
- Tennessee Education Association. (1983, August). The imperative for educational reform a special report: Merit pay. Tennessee Teacher, 51(1).
- Toch, T. (1982, December 8). Merit-pay issue dominates school reform debate. Education Week.
- Weber, G. & Marmion, W.H. (1969, May). Merit pay and alternatives: Descriptions of some current programs (Report No. 16). Council for Basic Education.
- White, E. (1983, May 18). Merit pay denounced by N.E.A., but Shanker willing to 'consider' it. Education Week, 2(32), 11.
- Williams, D.A. (1983, July 27). The merits of merit pay. Newsweek, 101(26), 56-58.